

The Classical Review

JULY 1897.

THE EUROPEAN EXPEDITION OF DARIUS.

§ 1. HARDLY any episode in the work of Herodotus succumbs more easily to negative criticism than that of the Scythian expedition of Darius; and in none perhaps has positive criticism found more difficulty in attempting to discover the historical foundations of the fiction. Our only chances of reaching the truth lie in the fortunate fact that Herodotus, here as in other cases, put together his tale from different sources, and, with that artlessness which is one of his charms, did not take the pains to disguise the patchwork. This is the normal procedure of Herodotus and renders his work eminently amenable to historical criticism, within certain limits. It is generally possible, when there is any historical ground under our feet, to discover an incongruity which lets out the main secret. Nor will this method fail us, as I believe, in the case of the Persian expedition beyond the Danube.

Recently the text of the Scythian episode has been submitted to a thorough-going analysis by Mr. Macan,¹ and illustrated by four most useful comparative maps, showing the various conceptions of Scythia implied by the author. I shall have occasion to refer frequently to Mr. Macan's work in the course of this paper, but at the outset I would acknowledge my indebtedness to his investigations, which I have found, as always, most suggestive.

§ 2. Having passed through Thrace and subjugated the Thracian peoples, who, except the Getae are said to have offered no op-

position, Darius meets his Greek fleet on the Ister, presumably at the neck, near Galatz, where it divides into 'five' mouths. Up to this point, says Grote,² 'our narrative runs smoothly and intelligibly: we know that Darius marched his army into Scythia, and that he came back with ignominy and severe loss. But as to all which happened between his crossing and recrossing the Danube, we find nothing approaching to authentic statement, nor even what we can set forth as the probable basis of truth on which exaggerating fancy has been at work—all is inexplicable mystery.' Herodotus 'conducts the immense host of Darius as it were through fairyland—heedless of distance, large intervening rivers, want of all cultivation or supplies, destruction of the country (in so far as it could be destroyed) by the retreating Scythians &c.' Not the meanest of the miracles which the story implies is the rapid organization and active cooperation of so many Scythian peoples over such a vast area—a feat which would be only possible under the empire of an Attila or a Zenghis.

§ 3. The story of this wild goose chase to the banks of unknown rivers beyond the Don is no longer mistaken for history by the least critical authority. But it is not superfluous to insist that it is futile and foolish to compromise with it; for the compromise is merely a guess. It is useless to suggest that, though Darius certainly did not approach the Don, he advanced to the Dnieper, or that, though he did not get to the Dnieper, he may have halted on the banks of the Bug, or that, if the Bug is out of the question he

¹ In App. II. 'Geography of Scythia,' and App. III. 'The Date, Motives, and Course of the Expedition of Darius in Europe,' in *Herodotus*, Vol. II.

NO. XCVIII. VOL. XI.

² IV. p. 190-1.

at least reached the Dniester.¹ All such suggestions are purely arbitrary; and that is objection enough. But apart from that, they are all forbidden by one general consideration. *It is not legitimate to assume a march eastward in any shape*; for instance, as Curtius suggested, with the object of opening up new trade routes along the coast. *For any such assumption involves the accompaniment of the army by the fleet*; and, if there is one fact which was clearly primary in the sources of Herodotus, it was that *the fleet did not sail beyond the Ister*. It should be remembered that the cooperation of army and navy was an invariable principle of Persian warfare in the west. We see it stringently applied in the expedition of Mardonius, and in the invasion of Xerxes.

§ 4. When the Scythian Walpurgis-nacht is left out of the play, our view of the European expedition of Darius is entirely transformed. The great result of that expedition was the reduction of Thrace,² roughly accomplished by Darius, completed by Megabazus. In Herodotus, Thrace is merely the passage to Scythia; the conquest of Thrace is a business merely subsidiary to the main business, the conquest of Scythia. When the design of conquering Scythia turns out to be a fable, the feat of conquering Thrace begins to assume different proportions. The necessary and obvious inference is that the object of Darius was the conquest of Thrace, and that, instead of Thrace being merely the preface to Scythia, Scythia, whatever is left of it, was the appendix to Thrace. And we may add that, as Herodotus has exaggerated the work of Darius beyond the Danube into fabulous dimensions, so he has underrated his work in Thrace. He represents the reduction of the warlike Thracian tribes as 'a walk over.' All submit except the Getae, the most warlike, who *πρὸς ἀγνωμοσύνην τραπέμεινοι αὐτίκα ἐδουλώθησαν*. We

do not know how much may lie behind this statement and we may seriously question the exact significance of the summary *αὐτίκα*. Herodotus is fearfully impatient to leave the history which he did not know, to get to the fiction of which he knew so much.

Another important and related corollary from the collapse of the Scythian fable is that the primary purpose of the fleet was not—as in that fable—to transport the army across the Danube, but to support the army in the reduction of Thrace.

§ 5. It would be wrong to infer, however, that Darius did not cross the Danube at all. The application of historical method to our data enables us to conclude with certainty that he did.³ There cannot be much doubt that Herodotus, as Bishop Thirlwall suggested, derived his story of the action of the Greek trierarchs on the Danube, when they were tempted to leave the Great King in the lurch, from the tradition preserved in the family of Miltiades. It can be proved indeed that this tradition distorted facts for the purpose of representing Miltiades as a patriotic Hellene; it can be proved that Miltiades did not forfeit at that time the favour of the Great King. But while it was easy at the trial of Miltiades to represent him as doing and saying certain things which he never did or said—of which perhaps he did and said the exact opposite—it is almost impossible to conceive a completely new historical episode concocted by the Philaids for the occasion. It is hard to fancy that Miltiades and his friends invented out of their heads a trans-Danubian expedition in which Darius met a disaster, if there had been no fact to suggest the idea. That would have been a stroke of genius. It is one thing to alter old, and add new, facts in a given framework; it is another to invent the framework itself.

This general argument would perhaps seem hardly sufficient, alone; but it is confirmed by certain facts which render the conclusion irresistible. It is confirmed by the relations of Darius to the adventurer Histiaeus. It is certain that Darius felt an abiding gratitude to Histiaeus, for some service rendered to him in the European

¹ For the Tyras or Dniester it may be urged there is something to be said on evidence outside Herodotus altogether. The notice of Strabo of the Desert of the Getae between the Pruth and the Dniester, and of the Dniester as the limit of the Persian expedition, lends itself of course to reconstruction. But what was the source of Strabo (or Ephorus)? How do we know that it was any source independent of Herodotus? Mr. Macan justly observes that the record 'may be in part or in whole a product of reflection and criticism, rather than a survival of living memory and tradition' (p. 47). Nor can we practically deal with the notice of Ctesias, or put any confidence in the fifteen days' march and the exchange of bows.

² And it is the conquest of Thrace without doubt that Darius means when he records an expedition overseas against the 'Scyths.' *Records of the Past*, 9, 68.

³ This seems to be Mr. Macan's opinion. 'Duncker has done more than any other scholar to rescue the story of events beyond the Danube from total and indiscriminate condemnation. The items...yield an historical deposit' (*op. cit.* p. 47). But on the same page he speaks doubtfully: 'If Dareios crossed the Danube at all, if the passage of the river be anything more than an exaggerated replica of the passage of the Bosphorus,' &c. Duncker's line of argument is not altogether convincing.

expedition, above and beyond the general service of help and faith, for which he rewarded the Greek tyrants. This is a cardinal point in the adventurer's subsequent career. It might, however, be suspected that the Danube incident was invented to account for the favour shown to Histiaeus by the Great King. And if it be said that the use of the same incident for a different purpose by the Philaids points to the conclusion that the incident is historical, it might still be argued that the Philaid version in which the interest centres in Miltiades was simply borrowed with suitable modifications from the Milesian (presumably Milesian) version in which the interest centred in Histiaeus. But fortunately we are in a position to prove that the groundwork of the story is historical. In a context which has nothing to do with either Miltiades or Histiaeus, in a passage which has no connection with Scythian geography, and does not even occur in the same book as the Scythian Logi, Herodotus, incidentally and as a pure matter of business, explains the Persian reduction of Antandros and Lamponium, Lemnos and Imbros by the following words: τοὺς μὲν λιποστρατίης ἐπὶ Σκύθας αἰτιούμενος τοὺς δὲ σίνεσθαι τὸν Δαρείου στρατὸν τὸν ἀπὸ Σκυθίων ὁπίσω ἀποκομίζομενον (B. 5, c. 27 *ad fin.*). This precious notice supplies just the corroboration we require. We can regard as certain the three main facts: (1) that Darius crossed the Danube, leaving the fleet to bridge his return; (2) that his communications were cut; and (3) that there was a division of opinion among the Greek commanders whether they should leave him in the lurch, and, although the bridge was not broken down, some contingents were disloyal to him.

§ 6. Having established on these grounds the conclusion that Darius did engage in a trans-Danubian excursion of some sort, we have now to consider whether Herodotus reveals any facts bearing on the object, nature, or circumstances of this excursion. We have not to attempt to discriminate what is probable from what is improbable in a tale which as a whole is entirely fictitious. Such a method is false and the effort would be futile. But we have to seek whether there is, embedded in the story, anything which by its heterogeneity or incongruity betrays an origin distinct from its fabulous surroundings. If there is nothing of the kind, the key for the solution of the problem is hopelessly lost.

§ 7. Now there is one remarkable notice in the course of the fairytale, which stands

apart from the rest—the notice of the forts which the Persians built on the Oaros. It stands apart from the rest of the narrative, because Herodotus vouches in a special way for its truth. He states that the remains of the eight forts were preserved to his own day.¹ This implies that he had information from some who professed to have knowledge of the existence of the Persian forts. I cannot agree to pass over as lightly as Mr. Macan the statement concerning the forts on the Oaros. Its significance is that for this point Herodotus had another source. That source may or may not have been some one who knew the Euxine regions; but in any case Herodotus was credibly (in his own opinion) informed that remains of the Persian forts were still to be seen. And we have to reckon with this, as evidence—presumptive evidence, that there were forts: possibly false evidence, but evidence which can be dealt with, and therefore may not be summarily set aside as either worthless or impracticable. Now it is strange that the one fact in the whole story which—whether true or false—is at least tangible and, by itself, intelligible, and which seems to stand on a different footing, should be placed in the most uncouth of all the uncouth regions which are described, beyond the bounds of Scythia itself, on the banks of an undiscoverable river. The tale, which says not a word of the city of Olbia, knows about buildings on the banks of a stream beyond the Don. It was hardly unnatural that the candour of Herodotus should be questioned.

§ 8. The accompanying geographical statement must be considered. Four great rivers flow into the Maeotic lake: Lycus, Oaros, Tanais, and Syrgis. It is only at this stage that Herodotus has discovered this startling piece of his knowledge. In his geographical descriptions of southern Russia he does not betray the slightest suspicion of it. In cc. 20, 21, and again in cc. 57, 58, we hear nothing of the four great rivers, we hear nothing of the Lycus and Oaros. In those passages Herodotus restricts himself to fact, and only the Don flows into the sea of Azov. In the second passage indeed he mentions the Hyrgis, which is clearly the same as the Syrgis, but it is a tributary of the Don, and can naturally be identified with the Donetz. It is strange that, when we are arrested, in the career of the wild tale, by ruined forts

¹ C. 124 τῶν ἑνὶ ἐς ἐπὶ τὰ ἐπελτα σῶα ἔν. These words do not suggest to me that Herodotus desired to leave the impression that he had seen them, without stating it. But they do imply that he had special reasons for believing the ἐπελτα to exist.

which stood in the days of Herodotus, we should have at the same moment to assist in the discharge of two unheard of rivers into the lake of Maeotis; for one could hardly think seriously of equating them with the Manytz and the Sal.

But this very incongruity furnishes us with the key. The forts were built; remains of their walls may well have existed in the days of Herodotus; but, needless to say, they were not built in the regions of the Don. *The tale has translated the forts from the regions of the Danube to the other end of Scythia, and translated the river along with them.* The *Ὀαρος* belongs to western, or as it might be called Dacian, rather than to eastern Scythia: to the same area as the *Τέαρος* and the *Ἀραπος*.¹ It was necessary to the artistic economy of the tale that the forts should mark the ultimate point which the Great King and his host reached; but they were indissolubly associated with the *Ὀαρος*; and therefore forts and river were transported through space together by a wave of the story-teller's wand.

§ 9. We have now reached two conclusions. The trans-Danubian operations of Darius were confined to regions west of the river Pruth (for, had he advanced eastward, the fleet would have accompanied him); and one of those operations was the construction of forts on a river. Before attempting to define the scene more strictly or to discover the object, I have a word to say on the description which Herodotus offers² of the river system of Roumania. Five rivers are enumerated as augmenting the waters of the Danube on the Scythian, that is, the left side. Their names are: (1) *Πόρατα* or *Ἰππερός* (2) *Τυάραντος* (3) *Ἀραπος* (4) *Νάπαρις* (5) *Ὀρδησσός*. Mr. Macan has projected these rivers on the rectangular chart of Scythia which Herodotus sketches in cc. 99-101. On that chart the Danube forms the west side of the rectangle and consequently, in all its lower course, flows from north to south, until it takes an eastward bend at the mouth. It seems to me that, when he wrote this account of the rivers, the geographer had not this rectangular scheme

in his head, but envisaged the course of the Danube (just as in c. 99, where he describes it as *πρὸς εὐρὸν ἀνεμὸν τὸ στόμα τετραμμένος*) in a manner which approached more nearly to its true direction. For it is hard to see what is meant by saying that the Porata (Pruth) flowed *πρὸς ἡῶ* and the Tiarantos *πρὸς ἐσπέρης μᾶλλον*, if the Ister's course was southward. Mr. Macan's map does not explain this. That Herodotus did not bind his imagination to one hard and fast scheme of Scythian geography, is shown abundantly by Mr. Macan's analysis. I therefore take it that in this context he conceived the Ister flowing rather from west to east than from north to south. Of the five tributaries the identity of the Porata with the Pruth is obvious. In regard to the Tiarantos, we are met by a difficulty. The name at once suggests the Sereth.³ But though Herodotus mentions it second in order, he goes on to say that the other three rivers, Araros, Naparis and Ordessos, flow between it and the Pruth (*διὰ μέσον τούτων ἰόντες*). We should have in that case to give up the comparison of the Sereth with the Tiarantos, and seek for the latter river in the Argêche or some stream further west. But as it happens that the Ordessos craves for comparison with the Arjish, and as the Aluta can hardly be anything but the Μάρις which Herodotus mentions presently, the Tiarantos would have to be the Vede, and the Naparis or Araros would correspond to the Sereth. It seems more likely that the first order is right, and the explanation (*διὰ μέσον τούτων ἰόντες*) wrong. Taking the rivers in the first order we get: (1) Porata = Pruth, (2) Tiarantos = Sereth, (3) Araros = Buzeo, (4) Naparis = Jalomniza, (5) Ordessos = Arjish. These identifications of Tiarantos, Naparis, and Ordessos are adopted on the map of Thrace and Scythia which Mr. Macan prefixes to his Appendix volume. If they are admitted, the equation of the Araros to the Buzeo logically follows.

Then Herodotus proceeds: *οἱ μὲν αὐτιγενέες ποταμοὶ Σκυθικοὶ συμπληθύνουσι αὐτὸν (Ister), ἐκ δὲ Ἀγαθίρσων Μάρις ποταμὸς ῥέων συμμίγεται τῷ Ἰστρῷ*. The Maris is not the Maros, which flows not into the Ister, but into the Theiss; a glance at the map shews that it is the Aluta (Olt). The Agathyrsi inhabited Siebenbürgen, and this river flows far through Siebenbürgen before it falls

¹ The name Lykos seems also out of place in the Maeotic region. This river, like the Hypakyrus, Gerros, and Pantikapes, remains unexplained. To interpret the Oaros as the Volga is to enter a new region and new difficulties. I cannot see the slightest plausibility in going to Hunnic (*var*, *fluentum*) and Lesghian (*wor*, river) for the etymology of the name. With our present lights, Iordanes cannot safely be used for the illustration of Herodotus.

² C. 48.

³ The earliest mention I remember of the name in its modern form is in the *De Adm. Imp.* of Constantine Porphy., c. 38, p. 171, ed. Bonn, *δ καλούμενος Σέρπερος*. In the same passage the Pruth is *Βρούτος*.

down into Walachia and reaches the Danube.¹

§ 10. It has been suggested by Thirlwall that in making an excursion beyond the Danube Darius only wanted to make a hostile demonstration, for the purpose of overawing the trans-Danubian Scythians and displaying to their amazement the power of the Great King. This theory is inadequate, for it does not explain the line of forts.

Another theory of the Scythian expedition is that it was an enterprise not of conquest, but of discovery. This view was maintained by Curtius. Now west of the Pruth there is only one exploring expedition that Darius could conceivably have undertaken, namely an Anaplús of the Ister; just as east of the Pruth the only enterprise of such a kind that could have occurred to him as practicable and worth the trouble was a Periplus of the Euxine. The Ister was one of the great rivers of the world, the Nile of the north, and one could imagine that the Persian monarch might have desired to trace its course or have had some thoughts of possibly discovering its source. Such an enterprise seems indeed one which Darius was the least likely of men to embark upon, but in any case this theory is inconsistent with our data. For there was no Anaplús. The fleet was used to transport the host across the river, and then awaited its return. The fleet did not accompany the army, and therefore the army did not follow the Danube. The fact that the fleet remained in one place while the army was gone is fundamental. Moreover the theory of exploration would not explain the line of forts.

A third possible motive for the expedition of Darius would be that of conquest. It might be held that Darius desired to make the Transylvanian mountains the northern frontier of his European dominion. The people of Walachia were homogeneous with the people of Thrace; in race and in language they probably differed as little from the folk between the Danube and the Haemus, as the Greeks in one Thessalian valley differed from their neighbours in another. It could then be maintained that the line of forts was a complement of the mountain rampart, and connected with the frontier in Moldavia. But this theory also breaks down on the data. Apart from the objection that Darius

would almost certainly have looked upon the Danube as the true northern frontier of his new provinces, it is sufficient to point out that the conquest of Walachia would certainly not have been attempted without the cooperation of the fleet; in other words, there would have been an Anaplús, and the river would have been explored as far as the Iron Gate. But there was no Anaplús.

§ 11. What then can the object of Darius have been? What can he have sought beyond the Danube? Not to conquer, not to explore, not to intimidate. But intimidation, discovery, and conquest seem to exhaust the possibilities. Besides ambition, military policy, and curiosity, what other motive can impel a ruler to undertake a dangerous excursion into the unknown? There is another motive which is not the weakest in the world. Darius wanted gold.

This is the only hypothesis which will explain the data. Darius aimed at gaining control of the goldmines of the land of the Agathyrsi—the goldmines of Siebenbürgen. Herodotus furnishes an important notice of the Agathyrsi. He states that, though in general their customs were similar to those of the Thracians, they had peculiarities of their own, and they were distinguished by their habit of wearing gold ornaments and their luxury. Ἀγᾶθυσροι δὲ ἄβρότατοι ἀνδρῶν εἰσι καὶ χρυσοφόροι τὰ μάλιστα.² The Agathyrsi were already tapping the veins of gold, which in later ages brought wealth to the fisc of Roman Emperors. The plan of Darius is clear enough. Crossing the Danube near Galatz, he marches up the course of the river Buzeo, with the purpose of entering Siebenbürgen by the Bodza Pass. He will leave a garrison in the country to work the mines, and its communications with the Danube are to be maintained by a line of forts, whose construction was begun immediately, along the river Buzeo. A Persian mining settlement among the hills of the Agathyrsi was a bold idea; but, if the expedition had been skilfully carried out at first—as Alexander the Great would have carried it out,—the design was by no means impracticable. In strong stone forts, a foreign garrison might have maintained itself for years; and improved methods of mining, with more refined fashions of luxury, might have reconciled the luxurious Agathyrsi to the presence of the oriental in their midst. The later importance of the Transylvanian goldmines shows that the venture was worth making. Dacia, after the Roman

¹ Xénopol maintains this view, I believe rightly (*Hist. des Roumains de la Dacie Trajane*, i. p. 11); but in doing so, he makes a curious mistake. He says that *Strabo* (7, 3, 13) states that *Trajan* sent boats with provisions up the Maris.

² IV. c. 104.

conquest, became a sort of Eldorado; and the goldworks were doubtless one of the chief motives which made the Emperors loth to abandon it.¹

§ 12. But the Persian enterprise was mismanaged. What happened we know not, except that the communications with the Danube were cut² and an opportunity was offered to the Greeks of leaving Darius in the lurch. Darius succeeded in reaching the Danube, whether with great or with small losses; but he had failed in the object of his raid. To seek to extract history from the fabulous story which has magnified a march to Transylvania into a march beyond the Don, seems, as I have already said, fruitless. But there is one detail which clearly corresponds to fact, whether it is an accident or a case of a real historical deposit. When the 'Scythians' succeeded in cutting the communications of Darius, it is quite certain that they would have been crafty enough, and sufficiently alive to the situation, to apprise the Greeks of the fact and urge them to desert the Persian. The incident therefore of Skopasis and the Scythians seeking to persuade the Ionians to leave Darius to his fate³ is essentially historical.

According to this reconstruction, the forts were on the banks of the Buzeo, and therefore the Oaros, which Herodotus locates

beside the sea of Azov, is the Buzeo. But an analysis of the description of the tributaries of the lower Danube made it possible that the Buzeo was there designated by the Araros. Hence it would turn out that the Oaros and Araros are identical. The supposition of such an identity, taken by itself, seems to have little either against it or for it. The double forms Hyrgis and Syrgis, Porata and Pyretos, are hardly comparisons to the point. Nor can I reject the possibility that the Araros may after all be the Sereth; from which it would probably follow that Naparis = Jalomniza, Ordessos = Arjish, Tiarantos = Vede. In that case the smaller stream of the Buzeo would be left out of this enumeration. At all events, the Oaros was, if not the Araros itself, the next-door stream to it.

§ 13. Curtius, Niebuhr before him, and others, have referred to reports of gold in Scythia as among the commercial motives which may have instigated the expedition of Darius. The object of this paper is to show that gold was the sole motive; and not vague reports of gold, but knowledge of gold in a definite region. And the Scythian expedition turns out to be a premature attempt by a Persian king to do what it was reserved for a Roman emperor to accomplish six hundred years later. It was an essay at the conquest of Dacia.

J. B. BURY.

¹ Cp. Jung, *Die Römer und Romanen*, p. 44.

² Macan, *op. cit.* p. 48. 'It seems improbable that Darius voluntarily cut his communications with the Danube':—rather, impossible, in the circumstances—'it seems probable that they were cut, and therefore cut by the Scythians.'

³ C. 136 *sqq.* The name of the chieftain Skopasis should be claimed as Daco-Thracian. Σκώσις is Thracian (cf. *C.I.A.* 3, 2496). The Aga-thyrsi were a Dacian people, as the name shows, and Idan-thyrus too is clearly Dacian (presumably Aga-thyrsonian) not Iranian. Nor is even the third leader, Taxakis, necessarily of Iranian character (for the termination cp. Thracian *Ῥαδάκης*).

P.S.—I regret that I had not read the illuminating essay of Mr. J. L. Myres in the reconstruction of the maps used by Herodotus (*Geogr. Journ.* Dec. 1896), till this paper was in type. He has put the cartography of Herodotus in a new light; but his conclusions do not affect my thesis.

CATULUS OF PARMA.

I wish to introduce to the notice of scholars the name of a Latin writer, hitherto unknown, whom I have found mentioned in the margin of two early MSS. of John of Salisbury's *Policraticus*. One of these is No. 24 in the public library of Soissons. It is of the late twelfth or early thirteenth century; the name of a very early—possibly the original—possessor is erased from the inscription recording his ownership; it was

at a later date bequeathed by one Laurent Surreau, a canon of Rouen, to the cathedral library of his native city of Sens; and in the seventeenth century it was bought for the monastery of Prémontré, where it doubtless remained till the Revolution. The other MS. is No. 60 in the library of the Faculty of Medicine at Montpellier. The earlier part of this is of the same character and about the same date as the Soissons

MS.: it belonged to the abbey of Pontigny. For the first two books of the *Polieraticus* these two MSS. agree in very full marginal references to the sources of John's numerous stories and quotations. Among these, four passages are referred to *Catulus*—or, as it is sometimes spelt, *Catullus-Parmensis*. I will give the passages with references to Giles's edition and to the reprint in Migne's *Patrologia Latina* cxix. The text will follow the best MSS.

(1) *Hunting*. Pol. i. 4. Giles iii. p. 24. Migne col. 393 D.

Eo denique tempore primum captiuntur Athenae, quo interdictae uenationis edictum censuerunt esse soluendum, et artem utriusque uenationis cum exercitio publice admittendam.

I can throw no light on this story. The expression *utriusque uenationis* refers to the chase of beasts and the chase of birds.

(2) *Gaming*. Pol. i. 5. G. iii. p. 33. M. col. 399 A.

Attalus Asiaticus, si gentiliu historiis creditur, hanc ludendi lasciuia dicitur inuenisse, ab exercitio numerorum paululum deflexa materia. Cum enim antiquiores illud exercitium dumtaxat approbarent, quod ad inuestigationem ueri disciplinasque liberales proficeret, uel recte uiuendi instrueret usum, hic subtili quidem licet infructuosa inuentione, ueteris exercitii duritiam non temperauit sed emolliuit, multis adhuc in pristina manentibus grauitate. A manibus namque Graecorum abacus nondum excidit, aut ratio calculandi, aut ludus in quo plene uicisse est ad denuntiatum calculum in campis aduersarii constituisse perfectam et maximam armoniam. Cum uero in eisdem armonica, arismetica, uel geometrica trium terminorum medietate exultat, semiplena uictoria est. Quaeuis aliarum, etsi contingant citra triumphum gloriam, aut ludentis felicitatem aut artis peritiam protestantur. Iocundum quidem et fructuosum est numerorum nosse certamina, qui depredationi inueniantur obnoxii, et qua ratione in castris sint alii tutiores, omnium periculorum ignari, nisi forte circumuenti ab hostibus captiuentur. Huius uoluptate certaminis Tholomeum (= Ptolomaeum), Alexandrum, Caesarem, Catonem, ipsum quoque Samium grauiores operas legimus temperasse, quo inter ludendum id agerent, unde essent philosophicis negotiis aptiores. Alea uero, exciso regno Asiae, inter manubias euersae

urbis non sub una tantum specie migravit ad Graecos.

I do not propose to discuss here the difficult passage about the game of numbers, especially as I do not think it is necessarily, or even probably, derived from *Catulus*. But what is certainly due to him, the ascription to Attalus of the invention of gaming, occurs, so far as I know, nowhere else. No other source than this passage of John is mentioned for the story in the treatises of Sanftlebius, Bulenger, and Souter on the games of the ancients, contained in Gronovius *Thes. Antiqu. Graec.* vii. Becq de Fouquières, who alludes to it (*Les Jeux des Anciens*, p. 304), gives no reference, but doubtless depends, directly or through the authors already mentioned, on John also. It has occurred to me that the phrase *gentiliu historiis* may contain the title of *Catulus'* book. If so, he must have been a Christian writer.

(3) *Gaming*. Pol. i. 5. G. iii. p. 35. M. col. 400 B.

Chilon Lacedemonius iungendae societatis causa missus Corinthum duces et seniores populi ludentes inuenit in alea. Infecto itaque negotio reuersus est, dicens se nolle gloriam Spartanorum, quorum uirtus constructo Bissantio (= Byzantio) clarescebat, hac maculare infamia, ut dicerentur cum aleatoribus contraxisse societatem.

No one has yet traced this story beyond John: although it has attracted some attention, owing to its occurrence in Chaucer (*Pardoner's Tale* 603—620), who took it, together with the following story from Justin about Demetrius and the king of Parthia, from the *Polieraticus*. By a slip of memory Chaucer writes for 'Chilon' 'Stilbon,' the name of the planet Mercury in Martianus Capella. For the association of this sort of games with Corinth cp. Euripides *Medea* 67 sqq.

(4) *Omens*. Pol. i. 13. G. iii. p. 57. M. col. 413 D.

Dum Gaius Cesar ciuili bello patriae immineret, quam fulminosus aer extiterit, quot habuerit igneos turbines, quot trabes emiseric, nec ueteres historiae sufficiunt enarrare.

CLEMENT C. J. WEBB.

MAGDALEN COLLEGE, OXFORD.

Apr. 2, 1897.

ON STYLOMETRY.

(Abstract of a paper read at the Oxford Philological Society on May 21st. by Dr. W. LUTOSLAWSKI, of Drozdowo, near Lomza, Poland.)

MR. LUTOSLAWSKI, after a short survey of earlier investigations on Plato's style, explained his own method of measuring stylistic affinities, which he calls *stylometry*. Stylometry is a new science, which investigates samples of text as to their style, as palaeography investigates the external peculiarities of manuscripts. The difference between stylometry and the investigations made heretofore by German inquirers under the name of Sprachstatistik consists in the following points:

1. Only equal samples of text are comparable as to the number of peculiarities which they contain, while heretofore each dialogue has been taken as one whole without regard to its length. It has not been noticed that the pages of Stephanus or of Teubner are not a measure of text because they contain more or less words according to the extent of Latin translation in Stephanus, or to the number of questions and answers beginning a new line in Teubner's edition. The ideal measure of a sample of text is the number of words, and as long as this has not been ascertained the most equal pages are those of Didot's edition.

2. Great numbers of stylistic peculiarities are required for correct inferences. C. Ritter investigated only forty peculiarities of style, and many other inquirers have drawn inferences from a single occurrence of a single peculiarity. The chronological conclusions drawn by W. Lutoslawski in his work *On the origin and growth of Plato's logic* (to be published in Octob. '97 by Longmans) are based on the comparison of five hundred peculiarities representing fifty eight thousand observations made by various investigators.

3. The different importance of stylistic peculiarities ought to be accounted for, and this has not been done heretofore. A classification of peculiarities into four degrees of accidental, repeated, important and very important peculiarities leads us to a more exact determination of stylistic affinities. An accidental peculiarity is a word or locution occurring once in a dialogue. If this is common to two dialogues, it forms the slightest link of stylistic affinity, the

unit of measurement. A repeated peculiarity common to two dialogues, or to a dialogue with a group of dialogues, corresponds to two units. A frequent peculiarity is equivalent to three units, a very frequent to four units. Thus each dialogue has a certain number of units of affinity with any other dialogue, with any group of dialogues, and this affords a measure of the greater or smaller similarity of style.

4. Accidental peculiarities have never been considered in the study of Plato's style except by Lewis Campbell in his Introduction to the *Sophist* and *Politicus* (1867). This class being the most numerous, it is very valuable, if only great numbers are taken into account. It is accidental that a word is common to the *Sophist* and *Laws*, but it is not accidental that the *Sophist* has twice as many words or other peculiarities in common with the *Laws* as it has with the *Phaedo* or *Symposium*.

In order to find a sufficient number of stylistic peculiarities for chronological inferences, W. Lutoslawski had recourse to many German dissertations written for the purpose of a study of Greek grammar, and containing full enumerations of all passages of Plato for each special use of a preposition or some particle. These authors had no other aim in their inquiry than to ascertain that Plato's use of a particular word did not essentially differ from the use of other Attic authors; but their enumerations afford useful indications for a knowledge of Plato's style. From such publications we might gather a list of several thousand stylistic peculiarities. In his first attempt at a systematic study of Plato's style, W. Lutoslawski limited the choice to 500 peculiarities, and to twenty-two of the most important dialogues. He proposed as the highest hypothesis on which all inferences from style are based the following law of stylistic affinity:

Of two samples of text of the same author and of the same size, that is nearer in time to a third which shares with it the greater number of units of affinity (each peculiarity being evaluated according to its importance as equivalent to a certain number of units, and provided the number of observed peculiarities is sufficient to determine the stylistic character of each sample of text). For the correct interpretation of this general psychological law the following rules are proposed:

1. A sufficient number to determine the stylistical character of a sample of text must be greater than has been used heretofore. For samples of text not inferior to twenty pages ed. Didot five hundred peculiarities have been found sufficient.

2. The minimal difference in the number of units of affinity indispensable for chronological inferences is now estimated to be a difference of 10% between two works, even this being in some cases insufficient.

3. The standard of comparison for the latest group are the *Laws*, and for other works the latest group of six dialogues: *Sophist*, *Politicus*, *Philebus*, *Timaeus*, *Critias*, *Laws*.

In order to test the law of stylistical affinity and the above rules, such samples of text have been compared about the order of which we have Plato's own indications. Thus he refers in some books of the *Republic* to earlier books of the same dialogue; in the *Timaeus* to the *Republic*; in the *Critias* to the *Timaeus*; in the *Sophist* to the *Theaetetus*; in the *Politicus* to the *Sophist*, and less evidently in the *Phaedo* to the *Meno*, in the *Philebus* to the *Parmenides*. This affords a number of tests. For instance we find out of 500 peculiarities of later style in Bk. I. of the *Republic* 28 accidental, 6 repeated, 3 important peculiarities, equivalent together to 49 units. In Bk. X 35 accidental, 14 repeated, 15 important, 6 very important peculiarities, equivalent to 132 units. This relation might be expressed in the following formula:

Rep. I. (20½ pp. Did.) : 28^I 6^{II} 3^{III} (= 49)
→ *Rep. X.* (19½ pp. Did.) : 35^I 14^{II} 15^{III} 6^{IV}
(= 132).

Other relations discovered by the same method may be expressed as follows:—

Rep. 357a-412a (37½ pp. Did.) : 47^I 20^{II} 22^{III} 2^{IV} (= 161) → *Rep. 412b-471c* (39 pp.) : 45^I 23^{II} 31^{III} 2^{IV} (= 192).

Rep. 368a-445e (53 pp.) : 47^I 30^{II} 32^{III} 2^{IV} (= 211) → *Rep. VIII-X.* (53½ pp.) : 54^I 36^{II} 29^{III} 5^{IV} (= 233).

→ *Timaeus* (53 pp. ed. Did.) : 123^I 58^{II} 44^{III} 14^{IV} (= 427).

Rep. X. (19½ pp.) : 35^I 14^{II} 15^{III} 6^{IV} (= 132) → *Critias* (11 pp.) 51^I 8^{II} 18^{III} 12^{IV} (= 169).

Gorg. + Rep. (256 pp.) 76^I 124^{II} 30^{III} 4^{IV} (= 430) → *Laws* (238 pp.) : 175^I 176^{II} 37^{III} 20^{IV} (= 718).

Theaet. (53 pp.) : 58^I 41^{II} 31^{III} (= 233).

→ *Sophist* (40 pp.) : 139^I 36^{II} 59^{III} 20^{IV} (= 468).

→ *Politicus* (43 pp.) : 163^I 43^{II} 56^{III} 19^{IV} (= 493).

More tests of the same kind have been used and the law of stylistical affinity, when thus verified, has been found always confirmed. Wherever we have Plato's own testimony that a sample of his text is later than another, the later sample has been found to contain a greater number of units of affinity with the *Laws* and the five dialogues which in style are nearest to the *Laws*.

This method led to the calculation of a table of affinities, expressing the relative value of the stylistical affinity of each dialogue with the latest group. The details will be found in the third chapter of the *Origin and Growth of Plato's Logic*, (Longmans, 1897). The new method of stylometry led to the following results as to the order of Platonic dialogues:

1. *Gorgias* is later than *Meno*, *Euthydemus*, *Protagoras* and all Socratic dialogues.

2. *Cratylus*, *Symposium*, *Phaedo* form a group later than the *Gorgias* and were written probably in the order here mentioned.

3. *Republic* Bks. II.-X. have been written in a few years, and are later than the *Phaedo*. The composition of this work has not been interrupted by other labours; only Bk. I. is very much earlier, probably written between *Gorgias* and *Cratylus*.

4. *Phaedrus* is written about 379 B.C. and after the *Republic*. The concluding passage, in which educational activity is esteemed above literary activity, is explained by the circumstance that Plato dedicated himself after the *Phaedrus* solely to his oral teaching, and interrupted his literary activity for about twelve years.

5. *Theaetetus* and *Parmenides* follow after a long interval, probably after 368 B.C.

6. *Sophist* and *Politicus* are later than *Parmenides*; *Philebus* is later than the *Sophist*, and perhaps later than the *Politicus*.

7. *Timaeus* and *Critias* are later than the *Sophist*, and probably later than *Politicus* and *Philebus*.

8. The *Laws* are later than the *Sophist*, probably later than *Politicus* and *Philebus* and written contemporaneously with the *Timaeus* and *Critias*.

These results have an objective value, because they are based on the broad basis of fifty-eight thousand observations on Plato's style. The remaining difficulties can easily find their solution by the same method, which also might be successfully applied to the chronology of other authors, especially Shakespeare. Stylometry is henceforth a new and powerful instrument of historical

research and deserves the special attention of all philologists and historians. The lecturer invites all intending investigators on this new field to communicate with him (74 S. Andres, La Coruña, Spain) and to avail themselves of his experience. He thanks the Oxford Philological Society for the

attention paid to his first attempt to lecture in English, which happens also to be the first public explanation of the method of stylometry, and the first opportunity for a Pole to express his views to this distinguished Society.

OVID'S *HEROIDES*.

(continued from p. 242)

XII 62-66.

Mane erat, et thalamo cara recepta
soror
disiectamque comas aduersaque in ora
iacentem
inuenit et lacrimis omnia plena meis.
orat opem Minyis: alter petit, alter
habebit: 65
Aesonio iuueni, quod rogat illa,
damus.

In 65 G and the old editors have *petit altera et altera habebit* which is un-Ovidian in metre and makes nothing fit to be called sense ('my sister asks and my sister shall have'). It is altered by some to *at altera habebat* ('my sister asks the boon but it was mine to give'), by others to *at alter habebit* ('but another, i.e. Iason, will have it'): these changes mend nothing but the metre.

All this while the reading of P is *alter petit alter habebit*. This was commended long ago by Salmasius at Iul. Capit. Maximin. l 'barbaro etiam patre et matre genitus, quorum alter e Gothis, alter ex Alanis genitus esse perhibetur', and more lately by Mr Birt in the Goettingische gelehrte Anzeigen for 1882 p. 854 who says 'bei der sentenziösen Form der Rede musste hier für *altera petit* nothwendig *alter petit eintreten*'; and it is printed by the three last editors Messrs Sedlmayer Ehwald and Palmer. The grammar is no doubt correct enough, but the sense is every whit as foolish as before. When you have said that A asks help for B you never add that the asker is one person and the recipient will be another: that is said already, and more than that. Reverse the order, say 'alter petit, alter habebit: soror orat opem Minyis', and you will get something like sense: then you will be saying first that one person

makes a request for another, and you will be saying secondly who those two persons are. But the verse as it stands is in the full sense of the term preposterous.

Ovid wrote

orat opem Minyis. alter petit, <im-
petrat> alter:
Aesonio iuueni, quod rogat illa,
damus.

'My sister asks my aid for the Minyae. The boon is begged by one but extorted by another: it is to Iason that I yield the request preferred by Chalciopé'. What moved Medea was not her sister's prayers but her own passion for Iason: this is stated first in the vaguest terms, then explained with particularity in the pentameter. The scribe glanced from *petit* to *-petrat* and left the verse defective, so *habebit* was tacked on at the end. A parallel will be found in line 84 of this epistle: Ovid wrote 'sed mihi tam faciles *unde meosque deos*?' which stands in P; but G and other MSS have this wealth of variants, *arbitrer unde deos, unde putabo deos, unde deosque putem, unde deos habeam, esse putabo deos, auguror esse deos*: all springing from an archetypal 'sed mihi tam faciles *unde deos*' with *meosque* missing.

XII 89-92.

Haec animum—et quota pars haec
sunt?—mouere puellae
simplicis, et dextrae dextera iuncta
meae.
uidi etiam laorimas: an pars est
fraudis in illis?
sic cito sum uerbis capta puella tuis.

It is no use to quote ii 51 'credidimus

lacrimis : an et hae simulare docentur? 'I trusted your tears : are tears also taught to feign?' where the interrogation and the present tense are as appropriate as they are inappropriate here. Here 'pars fraudis' means 'a share in your cajolery of me', and 'illis' therefore means 'your tears': but it is absurd for Medea to ask whether Iason's tears helped to cajole her: she knows that they did, and she must here be affirming that they did. *an* is therefore altered to *a* by Mr Lucian Mueller, whom Mr Ehwald follows, and to *ac* by Mr Riese. But still we are not out of the wood: *est* should be *fuit*: the tears and the cajolery are both of them past and 'gone'. This second error, though not the former, is abolished by Heinsius' proposal 'an pars sua fraudis': he compares met. xiii 349 sq. 'desine Tydiden uultuque et murmure nobis ostentare meum: pars est sua laudis in illo'. If you like to combine this conjecture with one of the others and write, say, '*a*, pars sua fraudis in illis', the verse will yield a proper meaning.

But the following is as near to the MSS, nearer to the parallel in met. xiii, and more pointed in sense:

uidi etiam lacrimas: pars est sua laudis
in illis,
si cito sum uerbis capta puella tuis.

si is Bentley's and should in any case be accepted. With *laudis* instead of *fraudis* the tense of *est* becomes correct: the glory still endures. Compare ii 65 sq. '*sum decepta tuis et amans et femina uerbis*: | di faciant *laudis* summa sit ista tuae' and x 130 'non ego sum *titulis* subripienda tuis'. I suppose that *ua* fell out before *la* and left *slaudis*, which was corrupted to *fraudis* by the simultaneous confusion of *s* with *f* and of *l* with *r*, just as, for instance, *fulgebat* was corrupted to *surgebat* at fast. ii 500: then *an* is possibly the missing *ua* but more probably a metrical supplement. The conjectures '*a*, pars est *laudis* in illis' and '*a*, pars et *fraudis* in illis' I should think less likely.

XIV 53-66.

Saeuus, Hypermestra, pater est tibi:
iussa parentis
effice: germanis sit comes iste suis.—
femina sum et uirgo, natura mitis et
annis:
non faciunt molles ad fera tela
manus.—

quin age dumque iacet fortis imitare
sorores:
credibile est caesos omnibus esse
uiros.—
si manus haec aliquam posset commit-
tere caedem
morte foret dominae sanguinolenta
suae.— 60
hanc meruere necem patruelia regna
tenendo
* * * * *
finge uiros meruisse mori: quid fecimus
ipsae?
quo mihi commissio non licet esse
piae?
quid mihi cum ferro? quo bellica tela
puellae? 65
aptior est digitis lana colusque meis.

This is Hypermestra's soliloquy on her marriage night, as repeated by herself. She argues alternately for and against the murder of her bridegroom: 53 sq. *for*, 55 sq. *against*, 57 sq. *for*, 59 sq. *against*, 61 sq., 63 sqq. *against*: it is pretty clear, both from the contents (*patruelia regna tenendo*) and from the place of that distich in the series, that 61 sq. must be *for*. Therefore I have adopted the *hanc* of V and some other MSS: P reads *aut*, G apparently *i*, without meaning; other MSS *haud* or *an* or *non* or *quid*, perverting the sense; Mr Riese proposes *at* which may be right.

The pentameter which I leave blank is erased in P, and the second hand, which is good for nothing else, informs us what the erased words were not, by presenting in a mutilated form the ridiculous and unmetrical verse which we call 62 and which appears in most MSS as *quae tamen externis danda forent generis*. G also has this verse, but between 61 and 62 it exhibits the verse which we call 114, *cum sene nos inopi turba uagamur inops*. V, which in this place omits the four lines between 60 and 65, presents them after 118, and what it there presents is 61, 114, 63, 64, and not 62 at all.

Now come to the neighbourhood of 114:

bella pater patruusque gerunt; regnoque
domoque 111
pellimur; eiectos ultimus orbis habet. 112
ille ferox solio solus sceptroque potitur: 113
cum sene nos inopi turba uagamur
inops. 114
de fratrū populo pars exiguissima 115
restas:
quique dati leto, quaeque dedere, fleo. 116

The couplet 113-114 is not in P and is not in V: the pentameter is tautological after 111 sq., and the hexameter is stamped as non-Ovidian by the scansion *potitur*.

Now can anyone doubt what lies under the erasure in P between 61 and 63? The verse 114. P ignored 62 and ignored 113, just as V ignores them; and it placed 114 where V places it, after 61. In the source from which most of the other MSS descend, 114 was wrongly placed between 112 and 115, just fifty lines or two pages away, and then the hexameter 113 was fabricated to make it at home in its wrong place, and the pentameter 62 to fill up its right one; and both the fabrications bewray themselves by their metrical vices. In the source of G, though 114 still stood in its right place, 62 was imported from the other family and set beside it, and 114 was repeated in its wrong place with 113 by a similar importation. The original reading of P, 114 after 61, and 62 and 113 nowhere, is exactly preserved (without V's misplacement of 61-64 after 118) by the Gothanus primus, saec. xiii, which I mentioned in my note on vii 23 sqq. as giving the right lines in the right order at xiii 73 sqq.

Now I am not the first to perceive that 114 stood in P between 61 and 63: that has already been recognised by Mr Lucian Mueller d. r. m.² p. 27 and Mr Sedlmayer prolegg. p. 54. But they both think that P was here in error, and I believe I am the first to say what when once said is obvious, that between 61 and 63 is the right place for 114. The sense is perfect. Hypermetra nerves herself to strike with the reflexion

hanc meruere necem patruelia regna
tenendo;
cum sene nos inopi turba uagamur
inops.—

'They have earned this doom by usurping our kingdom; we are exiled and beggared'. Then she renders answer to herself 'Grant that they have deserved to die: have we deserved to be murderesses?'

XIV 79-82.

Mane erat, et Danaus generos ex caede
iacentis
dinumerat. summae criminis unus
abes.
fert male cognatae iacturam mortis in
uno
et queritur facti sanguinis esse parum.

82. '*facti sanguinis*' is doubtless defensible: Livy xxxv 51 3 'nondum aut indicto bello aut ita commissio ut strictos gladios aut sanguinem usquam factum audissent': the *fusi* of G is therefore neither necessary nor even desirable, far less the *factum* of other MSS. But I confess that after '*cognatae iacturam mortis*' I expect something weightier than merely '*facti sanguinis parum*'; and I conjecture *sacri*. That means blood whose shedding is an abomination: Sen. Phoen. 277 sq. of the sceptre of the house of Laius 'nemo sine sacro feret | illud cruore', Thy. 94 sq. 'ne sacra manus | uiolate caede', Hor. epod. 7 19 sq. 'Remi | sacer nepotibus cruor', Lucan iii 314 sq. 'tractentur uulnera nulla | sacra manu', x 334 'mens inbuta semel sacra iam caede': iii 124 sq. 'nullasque feres, nisi sanguine sacro | sparsas, raptor, opes' is not quite parallel. The change is very easy, so like is *s* to *f* and *r* to *t*; and at fast. v 670 the two best MSS have *facta* for *sacra*.

XIV 101-108.

Per mare, per terras cognataque flumina
curris:

dat mare, dant amnes, dat tibi terra
uiam.

quae tibi causa fugae? quid, Io, freta
longa pererras?

non poteris uultus effugere ipsa tuos.
Inachi, quo properas? eadem sequerisque
fugisque:

tu tibi dux comiti, tu comes ipsa duci.
per septem Nilus portas emissus in
aequor

exiit insana paelicis ora boue.

At 103 Egnatius long ago enquired whether *Io* here has its first syllable short 'as in the *Ibis*' or whether it is the interjection *io*. *Io* with its first syllable short is a false quantity: at *Ibis* 622 *Io* is not *Íō* but *Íōv* 'the Ionian'. *io* the interjection is metrical; but anything more exquisitely absurd than that impassioned exclamation in this purely formal apostrophe to a long-departed ancestress I cannot well imagine. Here then is one difficulty recognised: there remain three which seem to receive no attention at all. Has anyone ever asked himself what '*freta longa pererras*' means? It describes very well the wanderings of Ulysses, but we are talking about *Io*: in what human tongue does '*freta longa pererrare*' signify to swim the Bosphorus? Again: *Io* is trying to

escape by flight from her own changed form, which clings to her still: am I the only person in the world who finds it comical that one in this situation should be described as 'sibi *dux*'? And again: does nobody else perceive that the hexameter 105 cannot coexist with 103, but must stand at the beginning of the apostrophe or stand nowhere at all?

The two verses 103 and 106 are interpolations prompted by the fact that 104 and 105 have by mischance been placed in inverted order, the pentameter before the hexameter. I have already pointed out a similar interpolation at 62 and 113; and at ix 82 Merkel detected another: 81 and 83 are interpolations prompted by the corruption of 82 from an hexameter into a pentameter. Our passage originally ran thus:

per mare, per terras cognataque flumina
curris: 101
dat mare, dant amnes, dat tibi terra
uiam. 102
Inachi, quo properas? eadem sequeris-
que fugisque: 105
non poteris uultus effugere ipsa tuos. 104
per septem Nilus cet. 107

For the contrast of *fugis* and *effugere* compare Lucr. iii 1068 sq. 'hoc se quisque modo *fugit*...quem...*effugere* haud potis est.'

XV 39-44.

Si nisi quae facie poterit te digna
uideri
nulla futura tua est, nulla futura tua
est. 40
at, mea cum legeres, etiam formosa
uidebar;
unam iurabas usque decere loqui.
cantabam, memini (meminerunt omnia
amantes):
oscula cantanti tu mihi rapta dabas.

41. The vice in this line was first detected by Wakker. Reading Sappho's poems could not alter Phaon's opinion about Sappho's looks. What altered that opinion was to see and hear Sappho herself reading her poems aloud: this is plain from the pentameter and from the next distich. Wakker therefore corrected *legeres* to *legerem* and so restored the sense but ruined the metre. There is no such verse in Ovid; the two examples in Propertius are very soon emended; the one example in Tibullus

is hard to emend, but his MSS are almost the worst in the world; Manil. i 794 sq. 'censu Tullius oris | emeritus caelum et Claudii magna propago' is to be corrected *haud indigna* or *nec Claudii indigna*; iv 661 'obruit, et Libyam Italas infudit in urbes' has already been corrected *Latias*. Here one MS has *tibi iam* for *etiam*, and this Mr de Vries proposes to accept. But write

at, mea cum *legerem*, sat iam formosa
uidebar.

legerēsatiā for *legeresetiā*. Of the form *sat* I spoke at vii 85: the present passage is imitated from Prop. ii 18 29 sq. 'mihi per te poteris *formosa uideri*: | mi *formosa sat es*, si modo saepe uenis'.

XV 139, 140.

Illuc mentis inops, ut quam furialis
Enyo
abstulit, in collo crine iacente feror.

Enyo is given by the best MS: the variants *Eriſtho* and *Ērictho* and *Erinnis* and the like are merely corruptions of this *Enyo* or *Enuo*: see Mart. spect. 24 3 *Ethiſuo*, *Ethriſuo*, vi 32 1 *Eriſpo*, Petron. 120, 62 *Erinis*, Lucan i 687 *Erynīs*, Sil. x 202 *Erinis*, all blunders for the same name. Here the editors read *Erichtho* and suppose it to be the name of a witch because there is a witch of that name in the sixth book of Lucan. Mr de Vries has an excursus on the passage and is inclined to accept *Enyo*; but since it cannot here mean the goddess of war he diffidently proposes to take it as equivalent to *Erinys*. Mr Palmer reads *Enyo*, in what sense I do not know.

It means *Bellona*: not of course the Italian goddess of war, but the Cappadocian goddess of hysterics whom the Romans brought home from the Mithradatic campaigns and the frenzy of whose votaries is described at length in Tibull. i 6 45 and more briefly in dozens of other places. Ovid requires a Greek name for Sappho to call her by, and takes the 'Ερῡ which was the recognised equivalent of the other *Bellona*. The question whether Sappho had ever heard of this divinity was not likely to trouble either him or his readers, who had been accustomed from their childhood to see the *Bellonarii* misconducting themselves in the streets of Rome.

XV 197, 198.

Non mihi respondent ueteres in carmina
uires,
plectra dolore tacent, muta dolore
lyra est.

Ovid never wrote such a pentameter as this; and if you say that the writer of this epistle was not Ovid, he never wrote such a pentameter either. Verse 40 cited above is a piece of false taste, but its perpetrator had his eyes open and gloried in his deed: this is a piece of sheer incompetence. Read and punctuate as follows:

plectra dolore iacent muta, dolore lyra.

est is omitted by one MS: it was not unnaturally added by scribes who did not see the construction. I think it less likely that the poet wrote *lyrae* and the scribes took it for *lyra ē*. *iacent* is in the ed. Ven. 1558: the change is nothing and the improvement is something, so I adopt it. But '*tacent muta*' is defensible: see Petron. 126 '*fabula muta taces*', Ovid met. iv 433, vii 184, Tibull. iv 1 129 '*muta silentia*', Prop. iv 3 53 '*omnia surda tacent*'.

XV 201, 202.

Lesbides, infamem quae me fecistis
amatae,
desinite ad citharas turba uenire
meas.

(To be continued.)

This is not Latin, any more than Prop. i 19 13 '*illic formosae ueniant chorus heroinae*': *turba* cannot be thus employed without an epithet. Bentley knew this right well, and accordingly conjectured '*ad cithararum uerba uenire meae*'. But all that wants doing is to strike away one letter:

desinite ad citharas turba uenire mea.

For the arrangement of words in the verse compare, if it is worth while, x 46 '*postquam desierant uela uidere tua*'. The phrase *turba mea* or *tua* or *sua* is frequent: am. i 1 6 '*Pieridum uates, non tua turba sumus*', ars iii 811 sq. '*mea turba, puellae | inseribant spoliis, Naso magister erat*', trist. i 5 34 '*cetera Fortunae, non mea turba fuit*', Prop. iii 3 31 '*Veneris dominae uolucres, mea turba, columbae*', Aetna 580 '*sacer in bellum numerus, sua turba regenti*', Sil. xi 395 '*uerum agite, o mea turba, precor*', Stat. silu. i 1 95 sq. '*tua turba relicto | labetur caelo*', i 2 69 sq. '*duro nec enim ex adamante creati | sed tua turba sumus*', Theb. x 297 '*sua quemque cruento | limite turba subit*'. In her. x 126 '*cum steteris turbae celsus in ore tuae*' the text is not quite certain. I have not quoted fast. iii 251, where *mea turba* is only a blundering conjecture of Merkel's; but I will quote, for it is almost as apposite, the true reading of that passage, which was discovered long ago by Heinsius and which no modern editor but Mr G. A. Davies has had the wit to adopt, '*mater amat nuptas: matris me turba frequentat*'.

A. E. HOUSMAN.

THE SPEECH OF ATHENE-MENTES a 253 seq.

AFTER expressing a wish that Odysseus might return in the full strength of his manhood to take vengeance on the suitors, Mentès says that this rests with the gods, and goes on to exhort Telemachus to consider (not how he may take vengeance, but) how he may clear the house of them, ἀπόρσαι ἐκ μεγάροιο, v. 270. To this end three measures are proposed, (1) before the assembly of the Achaeans solemnly to order the suitors to leave (the object of this is, as it were, to out-law them; cf. Andrew Lang, *Homer and the Epic*, p. 263), (2) to bid his mother return to her father's house, if she is bent on marriage, and (3) to go to the mainland after news of his father: if he

hears that there is reason still to hope for the return of Odysseus, then he is to (take no further step, but) possess his soul in patience for a year; but if he hears that Odysseus is dead, then he is to pay the honours due to the dead, give his mother in marriage, and, after all this, proceed to consider with all earnestness, how he may kill the suitors in his house. To hearten him for so great an enterprise, Mentès reminds him of the great deed of Orestes, the punishment of Aegisthus (the recollection of which by Zeus starts the action of the *Odyssey*). The general drift of this speech is clear, and suits both the purpose of Athene's visit and her assumed character of

Mentes. But there are two notorious difficulties, (1) the meaning and construction of vv. 277-8, and (2) the direction to give his mother in marriage, and after that (v. 293), when one might expect there would be no longer any suitors, to consider the means of destroying these.

To deal first with the second difficulty. Ameis-Hentze truncate the speech at v. 292: 'probably 293-302' (the exhortation to kill the suitors and imitate Orestes) 'are not original.' On this theory Mentes does nothing, beyond advising the journey, to prepare Telemachus for the high task presently to be laid upon him, viz. of helping his father in the *μνηστηροφονία*; and the lines 374-380, which contain the threat of vengeance, if the suitors disregard the solemn warning that is to be addressed the next day to them, being likewise excised, Telemachus is supposed simply to give notice of the meeting of the Assembly (α 372-3) without mentioning its object, so that one is left wondering why Antinous replies, 'the gods themselves teach thee.'

α 385

ἰψαγόρην τ' ἔμεναι καὶ θαρσαλέως ἀγορεύειν.

It is asserted that this threat is in β (141-145) an expression of vehement passion roused by the refusal of the suitors to withdraw, but that in α it is inconsistent with the character of Telemachus and the advice given by Athene-Mentes in the speech we are considering. But, (1) as a recent editor of α, C. O. Zuretti, remarks on v. 295, Mentes says nothing to imply that in his opinion only Odysseus is capable of attacking the suitors; and (2) Ameis-Hentze by the excision of α 293-302, 374-380 rob the book of its chief *motif*, the awakening of Telemachus by Athene to the full sense of manhood:

α 296

οὐδέ τί σε χρὴ
νηπιῶας ὀχέειν, ἐπεὶ οὐκέτι τῆλίκος ἐσσί·
καὶ σὺ, φίλος, μάλα γάρ σ' ὀρώω καλὸν τε
μέγαν τε,
ἄλκιμος ἔσσι' κ.τ.λ.

The goddess finds him a youth *ἐν γυναιξὶ τετραμμένον* (Schol. on α 94) put to bed every night by his nurse, and one who bemoans helplessly what he cannot end. She leaves him a man ready to do and dare, who claims from all, his mother and her suitors alike, recognition of his rights as

lord and master in his own house, and on the morrow takes his father's seat in the Assembly.

To the excision of α 293 *seq.* proposed by Ameis-Hentze we must prefer the explanation given briefly by Zuretti on α 293: 'the superior strength of the suitors was such, that, even if Penelope married, Telemachus could not eject them from his house; his only remedy, if he wished to enter into his inheritance, was to kill them.' It is true that after the marriage there would be no more 'suitors'; but is it really inconceivable, 'unbegreiflich,' that these men should still continue their life of riotous feasting at the expense of Telemachus? that they should not cease to abuse the rights of guests because their worthless pretext, the wooing of Penelope, was no longer available? and, if they should persist, must not Telemachus consider, how, his father being *ex hypothesi* dead, he should himself expel them? True, the condition, 'if they still frequent the house,' is not expressed: but it is also to be understood earlier in the speech where Telemachus is advised to go to the mainland, for, if the solemn warning advised in vv. 272-4 had the desired effect, then there could be no need for the journey: cf. Lang II. 264.

Further, given the possibility of these men continuing their plunder of Telemachus after the marriage of his mother, one can point to a simple reason for the marriage preceding the slaughter of the suitors, a reason as simple as the solution of Wilamowitz' famous *ἀπορία*, that Telemachus ought not to sit down α 437 before he takes off his shirt. One takes off one's boots before one's shirt, just as reversely (cf. β 4) one puts on one's shirt before one's boots, and one cannot easily take off one's boots while one stands up. So here; if the suitors should be all killed before the marriage, no one would be left for Penelope to marry. But this she must do, if Odysseus is really dead; the situation in Ithaca is otherwise unintelligible. As Telemachus says, she loathes marriage, but does not decline it: α 249 οὐτ' ἀρνέεται στυγερὸν γάμον, cf. τ 157. Perhaps the death of the husband revived in some measure the rights of the wife's father, who for the sake of the *ἔδνα* would force her to marry again: cf. ο 16 and τ 158. Or again an early custom may be reflected in the Athenian law inserted into Dem. c. *Macart.* p. 1076, § 75, from which it seems that widows remained in the husband's family only if pregnant. Telemachus' scruples about dismissing

Penelope depend on his uncertainty about his father's fate (β 131; cf., perhaps, β 134): he announces unconditionally that he will give his mother to a husband (β 223), if he can definitely ascertain his father's death.

I pass now to what is the real *cruce* of the speech.

a 275-278

μητέρα δ', εἰ οἱ θυμὸς ἐφορμᾶται γαμέεσθαι,
 ἂψ ἴτω ἐς μέγαρον πατρὸς μέγα δυναμένοιο·
 οἱ δὲ γάμον τεύξουσιν καὶ ἀρτυνέουσιν ἕδνα
 πολλὰ μάλ', ὅσσα ἔουκε φίλης ἐπὶ παιδὸς
 ἔπεσθαι.

Compare the words of Eurymachus:

β 195-7

μητέρ' ἔην ἐς πατρὸς ἀνωγέτω ἀπονέεσθαι
 οἱ δὲ γάμον κ.τ.λ.
 πολλὰ μάλ' κ.τ.λ.

External evidence against the difficult line *πολλὰ μάλ', κ.τ.λ.* a 278 = β 197 is only to be got by transferring to a 278 the note of the scholiasts on

a 279

σοὶ δ' αὐτῷ πυκινῶς ὑποθήσομαι, αἶ κε πίθῃαι·

that 'this line was not in the edition of Rhianus.' It can be omitted without injury to the syntax (though not without injury to the passage) as it forms a complete sentence. Such lines are omitted in good MSS. Thus G omits β 393, γ 396, F omits ϵ 351, P omits θ 106: cf. Molhuysen, *De tribus Odysseae codd.* p. 12. Accordingly the simplest course is to accept the scholion as it stands, and to suppose that Rhianus followed some MS. which happened to omit the line. The next best course is to suppose that he omitted vv. 279-292, either by an oversight on his own part, or because they were not in some of his MSS. The omission, of which, among our MSS., F is guilty, would have been due to the similar beginnings of vv. 278 and 292. Whatever the case may be, the external evidence against the line is naught in β , and very shadowy in a.

But can we dispense with v. 278? It seems rather, that the words *πολλὰ μάλ'* are indispensable, if one may (as, I think, one should) consider that the *ἕδνα* were mentioned as an inducement for Penelope to go to her father. As things were, the suitors were ready to give *ἕδνα*; see λ 117, ν 378, τ 529 (*ἀπερείσια*), and cf. o 18. But

if Penelope went back to the home *πατρὸς μέγα δυναμένοιο*, and the suitors also went to Icarus,

β 53

ὥς κ' αὐτὸς ἐδυνώσαιο θύγατρα,

then Icarus would have more to do with fixing the amount of the *ἕδνα*; and, as he was to receive them, he would see to it, that the *ἕδνα* were as large as possible, *πολλὰ μάλ'*. But the greater the *ἕδνα* to the father, the greater the glory of the daughter, inasmuch as she became *ἀλφεσίβοιος*, and her parents *μυρ'* *ἔλοντο* (cf. o 367). Hence a 278 = β 197 cannot be severed from the preceding line, and the two together express an inducement for Penelope to return that is indicated in the words of a 276 *μέγα δυναμένοιο*.

Now if we retain the line *πολλὰ μάλ', κ.τ.λ.* in the two passages, how is the clause *ὅσσα ἔουκε κ.τ.λ.* to be interpreted? a question which has to be answered, even if we regard the line as un-Homeric, for it must have been intended to mean something. The interpretation 'as many as should go with a beloved daughter' requires *φίλη ἐπὶ παιδί* ϵ , a collocation quite admissible by the rules of Homeric verse, but not read by the MSS. Ameis-Hentze take *ἐπὶ παιδὸς* in a local sense, 'bei einem Kinde,' but such a construction would be inadmissible, even if we followed them in regarding the line as un-Homeric. Further, if we wish to retain the line, we must make it square with what we know from other passages, viz. that the *ἕδνα* were the bride price paid to the father. The wording of the line (*ὅσσα*, not *οἷα*) excludes the view accepted by Zuretti, that no more need be meant, than that a portion of the *ἕδνα* were given by the father to the daughter. Besides, there seems to be no evidence whatever in Greek custom for Maine's view, *Early History of Institutions*, p. 324, that among early Aryan communities a portion of the bride price commonly went to the bride, and was the origin of the separate property of married women. In Homer there is no connection traceable between *ἕδνα* and *μείλια*. It would rather seem that, as women became less valuable, what was the exception in Homeric times became the rule, viz. that an eligible suitor should have the bride *ἀνέδνον*, and enriched with a dowry. This dowry the Law of Gortyna which gives the daughters a right to share with the sons in the paternal estate, treats as a substitute for the daughter's share in

the paternal inheritance (iv. 50, and p. 116, Bücheler-Zitelmann).

Giseke's interpretation avoids these difficulties. He proposes (see Ebeling's *Lexicon*, s.v. ἐπί p. 451b) to give ἐπί a final sense: the gifts of the suitors should accompany them 'ut ematur filia.' But his one Homeric parallel for this (I. 602) is insufficient and uncertain. Aristarchus and HL read ἐπὶ δώρων | ἔρχεο, but A and other MSS. give δώροις; δώρῳ, accepted by Van Leeuwen and Da Costa, may be the original of both readings.

However, there is, I think, another course, viz. to take φίλης παιδός as a genitive of price dependent on ὅσα (ἔδνα). There would be no objection to the genitive in such a sentence as 'ὅσα ἔδνα φίλης παιδός παρασκευάζεσθαι ἔουκε, τόσα ἀρτυνέουσιν, and therefore none to it in 'ἔδνα ἀρτυνέουσιν, ὅσα φ. π. π. εἰ.' By the word παρασκευάζεσθαι I have indicated the meaning that I wish to get from ἐπὶ—ἐπισθαι. I refer it to √sep. This root is limited to divine service in the Rig-Veda (cf. Leaf, *Journ. Phil.* xiv. 248), but herein is no sufficient reason against our recognising (cf. Fick, *Wb.* i. 138) that ἔπειν in § 195 ἐπὶ ἔργον ἔποιεν etc. is not from the √sep. of ἐπισθαι 'to accompany,' and of (P 190, § 33 ποσὶ κραιπνοῖσι) μετασπών 'rushing after' and of (πότμον, etc.) ἐπισπείν or ἐφέψειν 'to attain to' (cf. Leaf, *l.l.* p. 249), but from √sep. 'betreiben, besorgen.' Whether our ἐπὶ—ἐπισθαι is passive or middle, is hard to decide. The passive may find a Greek parallel in the expressions Δ 314 γούναθ' ἔπειτο, v 237 φ 202 χεῖρες ἔπονται, in which Leaf (*l.l.* p. 242) is inclined to see a proper passive of ἔπειν, meaning 'to be wielded.' The middle would find parallels in the Rig-Veda, e.g. sápane abhi rātīm 'they prepare a gift' (see Grassmann *Lex. z. R.V.* col. 1472): ἐπί (=Sk. *āpi*) has supplanted *ebhí (=Sk.

abhi), according to Delbrück, *Vergl. Synt.* i. p. 676.

There remains the question whether the suitors or the relatives γάμον τεύξουσιν κ.τ.λ. The words γ. τ. seem rather pointless, if the suitors are intended, as they are only too willing to arrange a marriage as things are, i.e. with Penelope in Ithaca; but the relatives would be better able to influence matters, if she were with them. It is no objection to this view that of the three verbs τεύξουσιν, ἀρτυνέουσιν, ἔπεισθαι, only the last, if any, is middle. In β 53 α ὅ τ' ὁ εἰδὼσάιτο θύγατρα the argument is that Icarius would better protect his interests, if the suitors dealt directly with him; but here the important point is that Penelope's interests would be served by her going home, inasmuch as the ἔδνα would be more, and the greater the ἔδνα to her relatives, the greater the glory reflected on her. For the use of the article to denote persons not explicitly mentioned before, but only indicated in the expression 'to the hall of her father' (α 276 ἐς μέγαρον πατρός, β 195 ἐς πατρός) cf. γ 4 οἱ δὲ Πύλον...ἔξον τοὶ δ' (sc. Πύλοι) κ.τ.λ., and see Ebeling's *Lexicon*, vol. ii. p. 4 s.v. ὁ Cγ. The interference of other relatives than the father in settling the marriage is represented as possible in Athene's false message:—

ο 16

ἦδη γάρ ῥα πατὴρ τε κασιγνήτοί τε κέλονται
Εὐρυμάχῳ γήμασθαι· ὁ γὰρ περιβάλλει ἀπαντας
μνηστήρας δώροισι καὶ ἐξώφειλεν ἔδνα,

where by the way an aorist seems necessary. ἐξώφειλεν would be a regular form, and, its -ει- not being a diphthong, would once have been identical in writing, though not in speech, with the form in our text, both being written with ε followed by a single λ.

C. M. MULVANY.

ON THE INTERPRETATION OF AESCH. *AGAM.* 69-71.

AESCH. *Agam.* 69-71.

οὐθ' ὑποκλαίων οὐθ' ὑπολείβων
οὐτε δακρύων ἀπύρων ἱερῶν
ὀργὰς ἀτενεῖς παραθέλξει.

It is the object of this paper to propose a simple explanation for an important passage in Aeschylus, that has been darkened by NO. XCVIII. VOL. XI.

errors of scribes and by modern commentators who take no account of the facts of Greek ritual. But if it is hazardous to hope that a new theory can be established and accepted, something may be gained by proving that all the received explanations of the text are untenable.

Before dealing with these in detail, we may gather one or two facts concerning

A A

these lines and their context that most people will accept as obvious. The words allude to the impossibility of assuaging some one's wrath by a libation: therefore the poet has in mind some divine wrath, and not the wrath of any mortal, such as Clytaemnestra resenting the sacrifice of Iphigenia, as Paley is inclined to maintain in a very careless note: it is scarcely necessary to say that libations are intended for the deity. In the next place, if the words have any special allusion at all, they point to Paris and not to Agamemnon or any other sinner. The poetic logic of the context and the whole ode proves this. The chorus begins with reflections on the sin of Paris who has violated the rites of Zeus Xenios; the Atreidae are compared to the desolate vultures who have been robbed of their young: and 'Zeus will send a late-avenging Fury against the transgressors.' The first part of the ode in fact is penetrated with the belief that the cause of the Achaeans is the cause of God and will ultimately triumph. It is not until line 131 that the singer touches on the crime of Agamemnon, the immolation of his daughter, which may bring retribution on himself and on his people. Looking now at the various translations that have been offered of this mysterious sentence, we may group together (A) those which agree on the whole in the interpretation of ἀπύρων ἱερῶν, the words that are the key of the whole passage, as a phrase signifying unhallowed or inauspicious offerings. Some who thus interpret the phrase explain the ὀργὰς ἀρετῆς ἀπύρων ἱερῶν as (1) the wrath of the gods or Clytaemnestra against Agamemnon on account of the unhallowed sacrifice of Iphigenia; this is the view of Hermann, Donaldson, Dindorf, and Paley. Others, e.g. Schneidewin, Keck, Wecklein, and Verrall, interpret the phrase as (2) the stubborn wrath of the sacrifice that will not burn, all of them, except Verrall, referring it to the inauspicious marriage rites of Paris and Helen. Another mode of interpretation (B) is that which explains ἀπύρων ἱερῶν as unburnt and therefore unoffered sacrifice, a concrete in place of the more abstract expression 'neglect of religious duties': thus Klausen refers it to the neglect on the part of Paris of the laws of hospitality, of the rites of Zeus Xenios. Prof. Robinson Ellis makes a suggestion in the *Classical Review* (1889 p. 132) that the words allude to the story preserved by Dionysius of Halicarnassus from a work by Menecrates of Xanthus to the effect that Paris had excluded Aeneas

from certain sacrifices of the Priamid family; and he would translate the whole sentence thus 'neither by counter-offering (ἐποκαίων) nor by counter-libation nor by tears shall Paris soothe the steadfast anger (of Aeneas) against him for sacrificial rites withheld.' Lastly we may mention the interpretation (C) of the questionable words which Conington, following Schneider, has maintained: ἄρτυρα ἱερά are victims that are not victims in the ordinary sense of the word, victims not offered by the fire, but by the sword, the dead on the battle field; 'Paris will not soften the stubborn wrath of heaven against the doomed victims of the sword, that is against himself and his friends' (Conington); or 'the fierce desire of Zeus and Fate for victims to be offered on the field of battle' (Schneider). Among the daring phrases of Aeschylus, we are familiar with 'the unbarking dogs of Zeus' as a synonym for eagles, 'the blameless poison of bees' for honey, 'the voiceless messenger' for the dust; in all these cases the epithet denies that the noun possesses a quality that in its strict sense it must possess; therefore on the supposition that all sacrifices were with fire, a fireless sacrifice would be a sacrifice in the figurative sense, perhaps a sacrifice of the sword.

Now a very slight knowledge of Greek ritual is sufficient to convince us that all these interpretations of ἄρτυρα ἱερά are quite indefensible. The main distinction in Greek sacrifice is between the animal offerings and the bloodless offerings of fruit, cereals and liquids, such as water, honey and milk. Of the former we may say that they were almost always burnt, and were called generally ἔμπυρα, fire being the more civilised process of conveying the offering to the deity; it may be true that the ancient votaries of Dionysos Ὀρέμιος devoured the raw flesh of the victim as a sacrament; we hear of horses being offered as victims by being driven into the water and drowned, and according to Plutarch (*Quaest. Graec.* xxxi.) the Eretrian women in their Thesmophoria did not use fire for the sacrificial flesh, but dried it in the sun. Still the term ἔμπυρα would on the whole apply to the blood-offering and the animal victim. On the other hand, the name, ἄρτυρα would be fitly applied to the larger number of the bloodless offerings; for though cakes or corn might sometimes be burnt on the altar, (Porph. *de Abstin.* 2, 17, quoting Menander) fruit certainly was not; and we may conclude that the 'sober offerings,' τὰ νηφάλια, which were frequent

in Greek ritual, were also *ἄπυρα*,¹ for they were identified with *μελισσωνδα*, libations of honey (Plut. *Moral.* 672 C). Now the bloodless offerings were certainly common in Greece; we hear of them as proper to the worship of Zeus Ὑπατος at Athens, of Artemis in Samos, of Sospolis at Elis; the *νηφάλια* were consecrated to the Erinyes, Mnemosyne, the Muses, Eos, Helios, Selene, the Nymphs, Aphrodite Ourania, Zeus Γεωργός, Poseidon and even Dionysos.² What dictated the choice of sacrifice is a doubtful question which need not now be discussed; the same deity might be often worshipped now with *ἔμπυρα*, now with *ἄπυρα ἱερά*. What is important is to note that certain of the ancients regarded the bloodless as the more acceptable sacrifice of the two kinds. The altar at Delos on which no blood was shed was called the pious altar (Porph. *de Abst.* 2, 28); and Pausanias contrasts the innocent ritual of Zeus Ὑπατος at Athens to whom *πέμματα* alone were offered, with the cruel rites of the Arcadian Zeus Lycaeus. Now not only is it clear that the name *ἄπυρα ἱερά* would apply to a large portion of these innocent sacrifices, but—what is more important—we know that it actually was applied. The fragment of Euripides (904), which the commentators have strangely neglected, proves the meaning of *ἄπυρα ἱερά* and disproves all the interpretations of the passage in the *Agamemnon* hitherto mentioned: the fragment contains a pious prayer to Zeus and a profound religious thought:

Σοὶ τῷ πάντων μεδόντι χοῖν
πελανόν τε φέρω, Ζεὺς εἴτ' Αἰδῆς
ὀνομαζόμενος στέργεις· σὺ δέ μοι
θυσίαν ἄπυρον παγκαρτείας
δέξαι πλήρη προχυνθείσαν.

The sacrifice of all the fruits of the earth is here 'the fireless sacrifice,' which is regarded as the holier; and the votary of Zeus Idaeos who speaks in the fragment of the *Κρήτες* boasts of his austere abstinence from animal food. We may now compare the passage of equal importance in Pindar's Olympian ode (vii. 89–90): *τεῦξαν δ' ἄπυρος ἱεροῖς ἄλσος ἐν ἀκροπόλει*. So far from these words justifying the interpretation of *ἄπυρα ἱερά* as an inauspicious sacrifice, the legend

proves the reverse. Combining the somewhat obscure statement of it in Pindar with the fuller account in Diodorus (v. 56) we have the following story: the Rhodians or the Heliadae, on the occasion of the birth of Athena, were informed by Helios that the community that was the first to offer sacrifice to Athena would enjoy her perpetual presence among them; in a moment of carelessness, as Pindar's words may mean, and as Diodorus expressly says, the Rhodians offered her a fireless sacrifice; and Diodorus adds that Cecrops offered her a sacrifice with fire on the Acropolis of Athens: and that both states maintained this distinction of ritual down to his own time. Diodorus nowhere says but may be understood to imply, that Athena preferred Athens, because, as we find almost invariably in her ritual, she preferred animal food. But the Rhodians certainly did not regard their *ἄπυρα ἱερά* as inauspicious, or they would not have maintained the ritual; nor did Pindar regard them as inauspicious, but on the contrary, as the cause of the divine favours which Zeus and Athena showered upon the island.³ That *ἄπυρα* may have sometimes connoted a more ideal sacrifice, even in the latest period of Greek literature, is suggested by a passage in Philo, *βωμοῖς ἄπυρος περὶ οὓς ἀρεταὶ χορεύουσι γέγνηεν ὁ θεὸς ἀλλ' οὐ πολλῶ πυρὶ φλέγονται* (*de Plaut.* ii. p. 154).

Looking then at these facts that show the prevalence of *ἄπυρα ἱερά* in Greece and the high estimation in which they were often held, we must reject all the interpretations in class A; for Aeschylus would have committed an outrage on Greek religion, had he used the expression as a synonym for 'unhallowed' rites. The cause of the error has been partly the wrong association of the phrase with the line in the *Antigone* (1006) *ἐκ δὲ θυμάτων Ἥφαιστος οὐκ ἔλαμπε*—which belongs to Teiresias' description of the ill-omened signs in the burnt offering: no doubt it was a bad omen if a bright flame refused to gleam from the victim when the fire was kindled: but such rejected victims were never called *ἄπυρα ἱερά*, nor does the passage in the *Antigone* bear at all on the

³ Philostratus in his description of the picture of 'Αθηνᾶς γοῶν gives us the same story; and he calls the Rhodian sacrifices *ἄπυρα καὶ ἀτελεῖ*, not because such sacrifices were usually 'imperfect,' but because in this special case it failed to win the highest blessings, though Rhodes was abundantly blessed for that sacrifice. The sacrifices offered at Thebes by the commander of the horse at the tomb of Dirce were *ἄπυροι ἱερουργία*. Plut. 578 B: it is needless to say that a state-ritual like this was not intended to be 'inauspicious.'

¹ Liddell and Scott, s.v. *νηφάλια*, suppose that these might be offered with fire, but this is an error arising from a wrong interpretation of the Scholiast's statement on *Oed. Col.* 100.

² Vide my *Cults of the Greek States*, Vol. 1, p. 88).

point concerning the auspiciousness of a fruit-offering for which no fire was needed.

The second group of interpretations which would explain *ἄπυρα ιερά* as neglected or unoffered sacrifices is met by an equally fatal objection; if a great number of sacrifices were regarded as duly and most righteously offered without fire, as we know they were, how could *ἄπυρα* signify 'unoffered'? Such an interpretation might at first glance seem to get support from the gloss in Hesychius s.v. 'Ἀθύτων Σοφοκλῆς ἐν Μυσοῖς. It would, however, require more than the authority of Hesychius to make us believe that Sophocles could use a phrase in a sense contradictory to its use in Pindar and Euripides and to the well-known facts of Greek ritual. But we need not suspect Hesychius or criticise Sophocles; for we are absolutely ignorant of the application of the word, or of the noun to which it was attached, in the *Μυσοί*. The word *ἄπυρος* was applied to many other things; it might even have been applied to an animal that was not to be sacrificed or not yet sacrificed. All we gather from Hesychius that concerns us now is that the phrase *ἄπυρα ιερά* did not occur in the passage he was quoting. As regards interpretation C, it stands self-condemned. All dogs can bark; therefore 'an unbarking dog' is no real dog. But many sacrifices were without fire; therefore a fireless sacrifice was none the less a real and literal sacrifice.

In fact the whole expression *ὄργας ἀτενέϊς ἀπύρων ιερῶν* if the words are to be taken together must mean *either* 'the stubborn wrath (of the Gods) on account of a sacrifice of fruits or liquids'; but there is no story in myth or history about any personage or community incurring the wrath of the gods by this innocent ritual; the *ἄπυρα ιερά* could not have been understood as an allusion to the offerings made by Paris on the occasion of his marriage, the proper name for the wedding ritual being *προτέλεια*, and the sacrifice being, as far as we know, a burnt sacrifice of animals: *or* 'the wrath of the sacrifice of fruits or liquids.' Now the personification of sacrifice at all, which such an interpretation implies, is entirely alien to Greek religious thought, though familiar to the Vedic religion: and 'the stubborn wrath of a sacrifice of fruits' is simple nonsense. Akin to this last interpretation is that of some older commentators, Schütz for instance, who thought that the phrase might signify the wrath of the Furies, because the Furies were sometimes worshipped with *νηφάλια* or *ἄπυρα* and the rite might stand

for the divinity of the rite. The interpretation is really more scientific than those of more modern scholars, and yet it is obviously wrong. Even if the word for the rite could be used as a synonym for the divinity, which I believe impossible in Greek religious phraseology, yet the 'fireless rites' could not be an intelligible synonym for the Furies, since a score or so of other divinities preferred the ritual without fire, and the Furies sometimes partook of animal food at the sacrificial meal.

It seems then that the words *ἀπύρων ιερῶν* cannot be construed at all with *ὄργας ἀτενέϊς*. It has been the persistent attempt to do so which has long made havoc of an important passage. Still less can they be taken with *οὔτε δακρύων* which precedes them in the MS. Three courses then are open to us. In despair we may believe that some words have fallen out after *οὔτε δακρύων*, which would have explained *ἀπύρων ιερῶν*; but if they have, we shall never convince ourselves or others that we have found them. Or we may regard *οὔτε δακρύων* as a corruption of some obliterated or misunderstood phrase; Keck's emendation *Πάρις Ἡραίων* leaves the construction and sense as hopeless as ever; Ahren's suggestion *οὔτ' ἀναρύων* 'drawing off liquids' gives us a word that might possibly be appropriate to the fireless offering which often consisted wholly of liquids, but the verb *ἀναρύω* has no sacrificial use; *οὐδ' ἀτερύων* is a good ritualistic expression, only as it is used of the sacrifice of animals it cannot be constructed with or connected with *ἀπύρων ιερῶν*. Or lastly, until the palmary emendation can be proposed, we may expunge the words *οὔτε δακρύων* wholly from the text as most editors, without fairly considering the question, have already done. Obviously if Aeschylus had already written *ἵποκλαίων*, he could not have committed so foolish a tautology as to have written *οὔτε δακρύων* after it; but as it is almost certain that he did not write *ἵποκλαίων*, we cannot dismiss *οὔτε δακρύων* thus. The phrase must be tried on its own merits. We have seen that standing where it does it renders the following words entirely untranslatable; and if we preserve it in its present place we must assume a lacuna. But the phrase must be regarded with the greatest suspicion by those who are familiar with Greek religious phraseology and religious thought. In a Christian narrative the repentant sinner might naturally be said to go away in secret, and weep bitterly; but with Greek methods of atonement for sin weeping and tears have nothing to do: in the days of

Homer (vide *Il.* ix. 499) as in the days of Aeschylus, the sinner among the Greeks who wished to clear himself would approach the gods with 'incense and goodly prayers, libation, and the smoke of sacrifice': if he prayed to Zeus Meilichios or the Furies, he might proffer his prayer with a fireless ritual; if to Zeus Phyxius or to Apollo at Delphi, an animal sacrifice would be in place.

In the elaborate description of the cleansing of Jason and Medea from the sin of kindred bloodshed in *Apoll. Rhod.* iv. 702, in Pausanias' account of the fruitless remorse of the Spartan King for slaying the Byzantine maiden, and of the means of atonement which he sought, tears of repentance are nowhere mentioned. And in the fragment of the Niobe of Aeschylus, a passage very similar to our present one, concerning the implacable character of Death, about whom a modern poet might say 'prayers and tears and gifts are fruitless all,' the ancient poet thinks only of the usual mode of appeasing deities, and says 'Alone among the gods Death loves not gifts, nor can'st thou win ought by sacrifice or libation; there is no altar raised to him, no holy chant.' In fact public ritual, not secret repentance was the usual *καθάρασις* for the Greek sinner; and, though the most advanced thinkers may occasionally have maintained that the pure heart and the good will were better than sacrifice, never, so far as I am aware, are tears mentioned as efficacious. Now Aeschylus was more conversant with Greek ritual religious thought and phraseology than most other poets. If his chorus of Argive elders wished to say, as it is clear that in this passage they did wish, that by none of the usual modes of atonement could the sinner whom they have in mind assuage the stubborn wrath of the gods, then they would most naturally say—by no manner of sacrifice can he do so: and if they wished further to specify the usual modes of sacrifice, they could not express themselves better than by saying 'neither by burnt-sacrifice nor by a libation of fireless sacrifice can he assuage God's stubborn wrath.' And this simple statement is what I believe Aeschylus to have actually made in this place. We must read *ὑποκάων* and *ἐπιλείβων*, very slight changes of the MS. text, which have long been made, the first by Casaubon the second by Schütz, though the value of the first and the inevitableness of the second have not always been recognised, nor have they always been rightly translated by the many editors who have adopted them.

ὑποκαίειν would be a ritualistic word such as we want in this passage, exactly describing the act of the sacrificer who lit the fire on the altar under the victim; so that the word would be generally applicable to burnt sacrifice. If Aeschylus really used the word here, it could convey no other save this literal and simple sense to the Greek audience. It is true that we do not find the word, so far as I am aware, used elsewhere in reference to sacrifice; but we may compare the curious title *ὑπεκκαστρία* borne by the priestess of Athena at Soloi (*Plut. Quaest. Graec.* 3). In a sentence where the expression *ἅπυρα ἱερά* was to be used to designate one of the two species of sacrifice, and a verb was wanted to denote precisely the burnt offering, no other verb was so suitable for Aeschylus' purpose as *ὑποκαίειν*: therefore we may believe he would have used it, even if it had not been so applied before, which is more than we know.

As regards *ὑπολείβω* it is almost a *ἄπαξ λεγόμενον*, with no possible meaning relevant to this place. I do not consider that it could possibly signify counter-libations (Robinson Ellis) or secret libations: it could only naturally mean to make a libation underneath something else: but a libation was always made on the top of something else, on the top of the victim or cake, or at least on the top of the altar; nothing was ever offered on the top of the libation. This fact has such ample literary and archaeological evidence that it may be sufficient to refer to *Il.* 1. 462: *καίε δ' ἐπὶ σκίεσσι δὲ γέρον, ἐπὶ δ' αἶθροισιν οἶνον λάβε*. (cf. *Verg.* vi., 256 and *C.I.A.* iii. 73). *Ἐπιλείβων* exactly describes the process of ritual and was a word sanctified by Homeric use; *ὑπολείβω* describes no known process of ritual, and is a slight error due to the common carelessness of the scribe whose eye was confused by the first three letters of the preceding verb. Now with *ὑποκάων* and *ἐπιλείβων*, restored and *οὔτε δακρύων* expunged, I venture to suggest what has not been suggested before, so far as I know, that the phrase *ἅπυρον ἱερῶν* should be taken with *ἐπιλείβων* towards which word it naturally gravitates. If we can thus translate the three words, 'making a libation of, or from, fireless offerings,' the sense is perfect, for the *ἅπυρα ἱερά* were usually liquids, *μελίσπονδα* or *νηφάλια*; and I do not feel that such a genitive is a grammatical solecism, as we have such a phrase as *πάσσε δ' ἄλως* in the *Iliad* and in Lucian's dialogues. If this were granted, we shall gain a simple meaning for a vexed sentence by an inter-

pretation that is entirely in accordance with usual Greek ideas and practice; and we shall be freed from monstrous fancies about the wrath of sacrifices that will not burn, or from the necessity of charging Aeschylus with writing mythological puzzles. Lastly those who reject οὔτε δακρύων may explain the interpolation either as an unprovoked intrusion of an alien idea into the text, or as a marginal gloss written after ὑποκάων, the rarer word, had been changed to the more familiar ὑποκλαίων. But if the general reasons which I have given for excluding

any mention of tears in this passage be unconvincing (and general reasons, proving a negative, are rarely wholly convincing) then we may at least take οὔτε δακρύων away from its present hopeless position between the libation and the fireless sacrifice, and place it at the beginning of the sentence, where its position would be far less incongruous; this would neither affect the metre nor my interpretation of the remainder of the sentence.

LEWIS R. FARNELL.

LATIN CORTINA 'POT': CORTEX 'BARK.'

I FIND the following entry in Wharton's *Etyma Latina*: 'cortina curtina caldron: fr. *curtus* 'cut down,' not tall like the *amphora*, cf. *Lucr.* 4, 1026 *dolia curta*.' Inasmuch however, as *Lucretius* is speaking of broken chamber-pots I find nothing to defend this derivation from the charge of being far-fetched.

To justify the suggestion of my title I note the fact that cooking-vessels were made of basketry in classical antiquity¹ as well as by our savages of North America.²

The objection will arise that *cortina* can not be derived from **cortegna*: *cortex*, which must give **cortigna*.³

The following words however seem to show the resolution of *a^{gn}*, *a^{cn}* into *āⁿ* in Latin, viz. *fenum* 'hay': *φay-εῖν* 'eat,' *fēnus* 'interest': *Sk. bhaj-* 'share,' *tēna* 'panderess': *λαγ-ρός* 'salacious': *Mānes* 'deified ancestors': *māgnus* 'great,' cf. *māiores* 'ancestors.' All of these words are right completely isolated in Latin, while *dignus* 'worthy' and the like may have been influenced by *deceat* 'it becomes.'⁴ The

only apparently completely isolated word I am acquainted with that shows permanent *gn* is *ignis* 'fire,' and I have, I trust, made it probable that *ignis* 'lightning-dart' belongs to *agere* 'drive' but has formed besides a popular relationship with *ictus* 'lightning'.⁵

Now *cortina* may be referred for its phonetics to the above group where *a^{gn}*, *a^{cn}* pass into *āⁿ*. The etymologies here proposed do not stand or fall however by the phonetic process which I claim is exhibited in them. Nay, *luna* 'moon' shows in an old Latin inscription the form *losna*, for which by comparison with Avest. *raoxšna* 'shining,' *Ō. Pruss. lauxnos* 'stars' the base **louqsno-* 'shining' has been set up. One may therefore write for *fenum*, say, a base **bhag-s-no* and thus the phonetics of *fenum* will not violate the phonetics of *dignus*. I have no quarrel with writing a base like **louqs-no* for which warrant can be found in several actually existing forms in various ones of the derived languages; and the claim of a base **bhag-s-no* has the *Sk. root bhaks* 'eat' to rest on, but I could feel no confidence in a base **maḡh-s-ni* for *Manes* because of Vedic *maḡh-s-ni* 'quick,' *Lat. mox* 'soon,' and I feel a similar hesitation in deriving *vanus* 'vain' from **vac-s-no* 'made empty,' rather than **vac-no*. I have claimed that the change of *a^{gn}*- to *āⁿ*- took place in isolated words only, and this seems to me much more simple than the assumption of an extension of all the roots involved by an *-s*.

An illustration of the various devices used by scholars to produce rigid phonetic

⁵ Cf. the author, *Am. Jr. Phil.* xvii. 24 sq., and add *Ov. Trist.* l. iii. 11, *Iovis ignibus ictus*.

¹ Guhl u. Kohner, *Leben d. Griechen u. Römer*, p. 200.

² Mason, *Woman's Share in Primitive Culture*, p. 101.

³ I cite from the *American Journal of Philology* xvii. 180 the following footnote of Mr. L. Horton-Smith as a recent utterance of the prevailing phonetic school: '*ānus* cannot come from the form **vac-nus* as suggested by King and Cookson—*vacnus* must have yielded *vagnus*, cf. *ilignus*: *ilex*, *salignus*: *salix*, *dignus* from **dic-nus*.'

⁴ Cf. the author, *Proceedings Am. Phil. Assoc. Special Session 1894*, liii. In the list there given I propose the following new and, I believe, indubitable cognations, *segnis* 'lazy': *sagina* 'fatling' (cf. *pinguis* 'fat': *piger* 'lazy'), *signum* 'mark statue': *scare* 'cut, carve,' *lignum* 'firewood': *ligare* 'bind up,' cf. *betal* 'faggots': *ḡēw* 'bind.'

regularity may be taken from *agmen* beside *exāmen*. Stolz¹ makes the law *agm* gives *ām*; thus *exāmen* is regular, while *āgmen* is for **āgimen*. Brugman² calls in 'apt ablaut's artful aid' and derives *exāmen* from **exāgmen*, while *āgmen* is from **āgmen*; Horton-Smith,³ however, writes **exag-s-men*, without explaining why we do not have **āmen* from **ag-s-men*. I confess that I can not see why any one of this swarm of phonetic explanations is superior to mine, viz. that **examen* 'swarm of bees,' is isolated from *exigo* 'drive out' to a much greater degree than *agmen* 'troop' is from *agere* 'lead.'⁴

Now the isolation of *corīna* 'pot' from *cortex* 'bark' would be perfect after civilization had advanced beyond the basket-pot.

I note here in passing how *ilignus* 'oaken' and *salignus* 'made of willow' have provided a suffix for *abiegnus* 'made of fir.' It may well be however that the suffix *-gnus* was popularly associated with *-genus* 'sort' in composition.

As regards the phonetics of the group *a^{gn}* in Latin I am responsible for the suggestion that it sometimes results in *a^{gn}*, as well as in *aⁿ*.⁵ I do not contend that one of these processes was taking place under the same circumstances as the other. My two most cogent examples are *femur* 'thigh' and *vomer* 'ploughshare.' Operating with the genitive *feminis* I suppose it to have developed from **fagⁿ-nos* and to be akin to *παῦς* 'fore-arm,' Sk. *bāhús* 'fore-foot.' For mixtures of *u*-stems with *r-n*-stems I cite the following examples γόνυ γόνυτος (**γόνυτος*), Sk. *jānu jānunas*; δόρυ δόρυτος (**δόρυτος*), Sk. *dāru dārunas*; further Sk. *manú*, Ger. *mann* < **manw-* with a long stem **manwan* represented in Gothic; Sk *dhānu*, with a by-form *dhānvan*.⁶ Similarly we can infer from *feminis* a stem **fagwen* alongside of **bhāghu* in Sk. *bāhú*. Our inferences for *vomer* are to be drawn from δόρυς ploughshare, δόρυς δόρυς δόρυς (Hesychius), O. Pruss. *wagnis*, O.H.G. *waganso*. These related forms permit us to operate with a Latin gen. **vogⁿ-nos*, whence **vonnis*, under whose influence the normal nom. **vover* has shifted to *vomer*.

I regard these two examples as entirely cogent to prove that Italic *gⁿ* gave Lat. *nn*.

My interpretation, now, of the kinship

of *vānus* ('empty' whence) 'idle' with *vacare* 'be empty' is that Italic *a^{gn}* (*en*) gives *aⁿ* in Latin, while the relation of *fem-in-is*: Sk. *bāhús*, and of *vomer*: δόρυς teaches that Italic *gⁿ* gives *nn*. I do not venture to state these 'laws' in Aryan terms of 'palatal' and 'velar.' The interchange of 'palatals' and 'velars' at the close of the Aryan period is an undeniable fact.⁷ It is believed by Bartholomae⁸ that this fact disposes of the theory of three gutturals. It seems to me to almost dispose of the theory of two gutturals. The guttural was a forward guttural (i.e. 'palatal') if contiguous with palatal sounds; it was a rounded-back-guttural ('velar') when contiguous with rounded-back sounds. Obviously every word-group would tend to a fixation of the guttural either as forward or as rounded-back, or else leave a pure guttural according to the prevailing phonetic environment of the guttural. This threefold differentiation could hardly be expected, however, to be thorough-going. Thus we account very simply for all the perplexing interchanges in the guttural-series.

The great trouble with linguistic science in its latest phases is that it works on the assumption that a phonetic change is always an accomplished fact, and blinds its eyes to the long periods of fluctuating tendency in which a folk divides itself into conservative and radical word-users. The fluctuation between *r* and *l* in Sanskrit is a case in point. This fact is undeniable.⁹ You may call this if you will dialect, but it is dialect of the individual, the recognition of which seriously impairs the inviolability claimed for the phonetic laws.

The facts of the primitive period are, alas, beyond documentary substantiation, but the fluctuation of 'palatals' with 'velars' was possibly of the same nature as the fluctuation between *r* and *l* in Sanskrit in words that show only an *l* in the related languages. Who shall say that 'palatal' and 'velar' may not be but extreme variations of a guttural mean?

⁷ Cf. Brugmann, *Gr.* i. 344 sq., Bechtel, *Hauptprobleme* 377 sq., Noreen, *Urgerm. Lautlehre*, 199. I note that the *vomer*-group just discussed with a 'velar' (**vohg-*) is certainly cognate to the root of *veho* 'ride' with a palatal (**vegh-*).

⁸ *Grundriss d. Iran. Philologie* i. 22.

⁹ 'The semivowels *r* and *l* are very widely interchangeable in Sanskrit, both in roots and in suffixes, and even in prefixes; there are few roots containing a (sic) *l* which do not show also forms with *r*; words written with the one letter are found in other texts, or in other parts of the same text, written with the other.' Whitney *Sk. Gr.* ² § 53 b.

¹ In Iwan Müller's *Handbuch*², ii. § 65, 2.

² *Grundriss* i. § 506.

³ *Am. Jour. Phil.* xvii. 180.

Proc. Am. Phil. Assoc. 1895, lxiv.

⁵ *Proc. Am. Phil. Assoc.* Special Session 1894, lii.

⁶ From Pedersen, Kuhn's *Zeitschrift* 32, 253.

In all this matter too little notice has been paid to the function of the hearing ear. Our English language with its single *n* designates the sounds for the hearing ear quite sufficiently; the Sanskrit exactness of *ñ*, *ṇ*, *ṇ* and *n* is a finesse due to the speaking tongue. The hearing ear in all of these cases takes cognizance of nasality, the speaking voice makes the closure for the nasal at a point convenient for the neighbouring consonants. So, to my mind, the

gutturals shift parasitically to suit contiguous vowels. The guttural would tend to permanence for any group of words so far as its members were felt to be akin, but a change in the character of the contiguous vowel would form a counter-tendency, the stronger in proportion to the isolation of any word from its group in meaning.

EDWIN W. FAY.

Lexington, Va.

ETYMOLOGY OF LATIN *INGENS*.

Mr. Fay (*Class. Rev.* Feb. 1897, p. 12) gives two objections to the connection of *ingens* with *γένος*, etc. 'compounded with an indeterminate preposition.' As neither reason concerns the preposition itself, it may be concluded that it is unobjectionable. It is curious that he should not have mentioned that the last syllable of the reduplicated stem *γγαυr-* is the exact phonetic equivalent of the Latin *gent-*. In the face of this it is

undesirable to connect *ingens* with the Greek *ἄγαν*, which of course looks like the accusative of a substantive *ἄγᾱ* (borrowed in Attic) connected with *ἄγαμαι*. I hold that there is not a single certain example of initial Skt. *ā* or initial Grk. *ā* occurring in words akin to forms beginning with *m* followed by a vowel.

C. A. M. FENNELL.

ON ARISTOTLE'S *POETICS* c. 25.

¹ AR. *Poet.* xxv. 6. οἷον καὶ Σοφοκλῆς ἔφη αὐτὸς μὲν οἷους δέει ποιεῖν, Εὐριπίδην δὲ οἷοι εἶναι.

Prof. Butcher thus translates this sentence, 'just as Sophocles said that he drew men as they ought to be drawn; Euripides, as they are.' In the first clause he understands ποιεῖν with δέει, herein agreeing with Dr. Verrall, who in the *Classical Review* for 1889 (vol. iii. p. 27), in a notice of Berlage's *De Euripide Philosopho*, writes as follows upon this sentence, 'it seems that the author renders this *dictum*, according to the strangely persistent error, as if the infinitive to be supplied with δέει were εἶναι. This is not merely impossible by the form of the sentence, but makes Sophocles' criticism absurdly untrue. The infinitive supplied is ποιεῖν: Sophocles admitted reality only within the limits imposed by poetic art, or rather by the Greek conception of dramatic art. Euripides, with or without reason, overstepped those limits.' Before Dr. Verrall, it appears that Welcker also took

the sentence in the same way. In a note Prof. Butcher says,¹ 'Vahlen, however, understands εἶναι with δέει.' I have not met with any commentator (though I admit there are many I have not seen at all) except the three above named who does not understand εἶναι with δέει. Dacier, Hurd, Lessing, Twining, Tyrwhitt, Stahr and Prickard all agree on the grammatical construction of the sentence, however much they differ among themselves as to its meaning. The 'error' then, if it is an error, is, as Dr. Verrall remarks, 'strangely persistent,' but is it an error? While agreeing with Dr. Verrall and Prof. Butcher upon the explanation I venture to doubt the correctness of their rendering.

Before dealing with the rendering it is well to consider the meaning which is intended to be conveyed. There are two interpretations given. (1) When Sophocles said he drew men 'as they ought to be' he referred to moral goodness. Thus Dacier

¹ *Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art*, p. 343, note 3.

translates, 'que Sophocle faisait ses héros, comme ils devaient être, et qu' Euripide les faisait comme ils étaient,' and explains, 'Sophocle tâchait de rendre ses imitations parfaites, en suivant toujours bien plus ce qu' une belle nature était capable de faire, que ce qu'elle faisait. Au lieu qu' Euripide ne travaillait qu'à les rendre semblables, en consultant davantage ce que cette même nature faisait, que ce qu'elle était capable de faire.' This explanation is quoted with approbation and adopted by Twining and Mr. Prickard.¹ It cannot be denied that there are several passages in the *Poetics* that give colour to it, 'Tragedy aims at representing men as better than in actual life (*βελτίους τῶν νῦν*),' and 'Epic poetry agrees with Tragedy in so far as it is an imitation in verse of characters of a higher type (*μῦθος σπουδαίων*),' and again, 'in respect of character there are four things to be aimed at, First, and most important, it must be good (*τὰ ἤθη... ὅπως χρῆσθαι ἦ*):' still, Prof. Butcher shows that these expressions are qualified by others, and this explanation is so opposed to Aristotle's theory of Poetry and Fine Art on the whole, and so contrary to the practice of Homer and Sophocles that it can hardly be the correct one.

(2) That Sophocles referred to his representation of the type and not the individual, the universal not the particular. Bishop Hurd in his commentary on the *Ars Poetica* of Horace explains as follows, 'The meaning is, Sophocles from his more extended commerce with mankind, had enlarged and widened the narrow, partial conception, arising from the contemplation of *particular* characters, into a complete comprehension of the *kind*. Whereas the philosophic Euripides, having been mostly conversant in the academy, when he came to look into life, keeping his eye too intent on single, really existing personages, sunk the *kind* in the *individual*; and so painted his characters naturally indeed, and *truly*, with regard to the objects in view, but sometimes without that general and universally striking likeness which is demanded to the full exhibition of poetical truth.' This explanation is approved by Lessing, and by Stahr, who translates the saying of Sophocles, 'er schildere Menschen wie sie sein müssen, Euripides dagegen, wie sie in die Wirklichkeit sind,' and adds in a note 'nicht *sittlich* bessere, idealere Menschen hat Sophokles nach diesem seinem Ausspruche schildern wollen und geschildert, sondern "künstlerisch wahre," d. h. solche,

¹ Aristotle on the Art of Poetry, p. 95, note 33.

wie sie nach den Gesetzen der kunst sein müssen.' Dr. Verrall, as above quoted, agrees with this, so does Prof. Butcher, who says, 'the characters of Sophocles answer to the higher dramatic requirements; they are typical of universal human nature in its deeper and abiding aspects; they are ideal, but ideally human.' This explanation is also that suggested by the *Poetics* as a whole and in many passages. I need only quote one from ch. 9, 'Poetry tends to express the universal, history the particular. The universal tells us how a person of given character will on occasion speak or act, according to the law of probability or necessity; and it is this universality at which Poetry aims in giving expressive names to the characters.' There is, no doubt, some difficulty in those expressions of Aristotle that require a certain amount of moral goodness in the characters of tragedy, but Prof. Butcher goes far to reconcile them with the interpretation last enunciated by pointing out, first, that Aristotle does not seem quite to have emancipated himself from some consequences of the ancient opinion that the aim of poetry is moral improvement, and secondly, that the goodness of character required is not really coextensive with moral goodness but that 'the characters portrayed by epic and tragic poetry have their basis in moral goodness; but the goodness is of the heroic order. It is quite distinct from plain, unassuming virtue. It has nothing in it common or mean. Whatever be the moral imperfections in the characters, they are such as impress our imagination, and arouse the sense of grandeur: we are lifted above the reality of daily life.'² If I may be allowed to say so, I agree with Prof. Butcher in his interpretation and in his further explanation. Aristotle does not quite come up to the doctrine of *l'art pour l'art*, but he is much nearer to it than any of his successors in ancient times. I have purposely avoided the use of the word 'ideal,' as it is ambiguous, and indeed is used in two different senses in the passages above quoted from Stahr and Prof. Butcher.

Now we come to the words of our text. Dr. Verrall assumes that if we understand *εἶναι* the reference must be to moral goodness, which reference as he rightly says would be 'absurdly untrue.' But is such a reference necessary? I cannot think so. None of the commentators (as far as I have seen) who adopt the same interpretation as Dr. Verrall find any difficulty in understanding

p. 217.

εἶναι and translating 'as they ought to be,' and even Prof. Butcher says, 'even if we accept this construction [i.e. understanding *εἶναι*], the *δεῖ* will still be the "ought" of aesthetic obligation, not the moral "ought." This is, in my judgment, precisely so. I admit that if the sentence were isolated it would not only be natural to understand *ποιεῖν*, but this would be the only possible construction. But the context makes all the difference. We will then look at the context. At the beginning of c. 25 we read, "With respect to critical difficulties and their solutions, the number and nature of the sources from which they may be drawn may be thus exhibited. The poet being an imitator, like a painter or any other artist, must of necessity imitate one of three objects,—things as they were or are, things as they are said or thought to be, or things as they ought to be (*ἢ γὰρ οἷα ἦν ἢ ἔστιν, ἢ οἷα φασὶν καὶ δοκεῖ, ἢ οἷα εἶναι δεῖ*).' Then, after some remarks upon the two kinds of faults in poetry, sec. 6 goes on, 'Further, if it be objected that the description is not true to fact, the poet may perhaps reply,—"But the objects are as they ought to be," just as Sophocles said that he drew men as they ought to be; Euripides as they are. In this way the objection may be met. If, however, the representation be of neither kind, the poet may answer,—"This is what is commonly said" (*πρὸς δὲ τοῦτοις ἐὰν ἐπιτιμᾶται οὔτι οὐκ ἀληθῆ, ἀλλ' ἴσως <ὥς> δεῖ—οἷον καὶ Σοφοκλῆς ἔφη αὐτὸς μὲν οἷους δεῖ ποιεῖν, Εὐριπίδην δὲ οἷοι εἶσιν—ταύτη λυτέον. εἰ δὲ μηδετέρως, οὔτι οὕτω φασίν*).'

Here it is clear that *οὐκ ἀληθῆ* and *οἷοι εἶσιν* refer to *οἷα ἦν ἢ ἔστιν* in the previous passage, <ὥς> *δεῖ* and *οἷους δεῖ* to *οἷα εἶναι δεῖ*, and *οὕτω φασὶν* to *οἷα φασὶν καὶ δοκεῖ*. I am unable then to see any difficulty in taking *οἷους δεῖ* in the second passage as equivalent to *οἷους εἶναι δεῖ* when we have had already *οἷα εἶναι δεῖ*. Thus far for the grammar. But I also further maintain that to bring out the meaning of Sophocles' saying—the meaning which both Dr. Verrall and Prof. Butcher assign to it—it is better to understand *εἶναι* than *δεῖ*. It must be noticed that it is not what Aristotle says of Sophocles and Euripides, but what Sophocles says of himself and Euripides. Aristotle indeed might very well have said that Sophocles 'drew men as they ought to be drawn,' because his views of artistic representation agree with those of Sophocles. But it seems to me that the reply of Sophocles here given amounts to this, 'I do not profess to imitate men as they are found in real life—I leave that to Euripides. I imitate men as they ought to be—ought, that is, according to the canons of art to which I conform.' This is merely saying, I have one theory of art, Euripides another, and appears to my mind to be more pointed as an answer to the objection here propounded, and more consistent with the *εὐκολία* of Sophocles, than the somewhat arrogant remark, 'I draw men as they ought to be drawn, Euripides as they are.'

R. C. SEATON.

ARISTOPHANES, *FROGS* 1435 *sqq.*

THE MSS. give:—

- ΔΙ. ἀλλ' ἔτι μίαν γνώμην ἐκότερος
εἶπατον
περὶ τῆς πόλεως ἦντιν' ἔχεται
σωτηρίαν.
ΕΥ. εἰ τις περὶ σῶσας Κλεόκριτον Κινησίᾳ 1437
αἶροιεν αἶραι πελαγίαν ὑπὲρ πλάκα.
ΔΙ. γέλοιον ἂν φαίνοιτο· νοῦν δ' ἔχει
τίνα;
ΕΥ. εἰ ναυμαχοῖεν, κατ' ἔχοντες ὀξείδης
βαίνοιεν ἐς τὰ βλέφαρα τῶν ἐναντίων. 1441
ἐγὼ μὲν οἶδα καὶ θέλω φράζειν. ΔΙ.
λέγε. 1442
ΕΥ. ὅταν τὰ νῦν ἄπιστα πίσθ' ἡγώμεθα, 1443
τὰ δ' ὄντα πίστ' ἄπιστα.

- ΔΙ. πῶς; οὐ μανθάνω.
ἀμαθέστερόν πως εἶπε καὶ σαφέστερον.
ΕΥ. εἰ τῶν πολιτῶν οἷσι νῦν πιστεῖνόμεν,
τούτοις ἀπιστήσεται, οἷς δ' οὐ
χρώμεθα,
τούτοις χρησαίμεσθ', ἴσως σωθεῖμεν
ἂν.
εἰ νῦν γε δυστυχούμεν ἐν τούτοις,
πῶς
τάναντι' ἂν πράξαντες οὐ σωζοίμεθ'
ἂν; 1450
ΔΙ. εὐ γ', ὦ Παλάμηδες, ὦ σοφωτάτη
φύσις. 1451
τάντι' ἴσπερ' αὐτὸς ἦρπες ἢ Κηφισοφῶν;

EY. ἐγὼ μόνος· τὰς δ' ὀξέδας Κηφισοφῶν. 1453
ΔΙ. τί δαὶ σὺ; τί λέγεις;

The difficulty of interpreting this passage in any coherent manner has been recognised since the days of Aristarchus. v. 1442 is obviously not tolerable where it stands, and vv. 1451—1453 plainly belong in sense to vv. 1437—1441, and cannot follow vv. 1443—1450. The usual expedient of bracketing or printing in small type is unsatisfactory. The following explanation and arrangement are offered with some confidence.

That there were two editions of this play for two occasions is well known. Is it not therefore self-evident that, when a piece of political advice 'to save the country' was to

Edition A (or B) vv. 1443—1450 (eight lines).

EY. ὅταν τὰ νῦν ἄπιστα...
...σφζοίμεθ' ἄν;

After which in either edition we proceed with the appeal to Aeschylus

ΔΙ. τί δαὶ σὺ; τί λέγεις; etc.

The cause of the disjointed arrangement I take to be that the words EY. εἰ τις πτερώσας κ.τ.λ.; noted from the first edition, were accidentally inserted before, instead of after, 1442. When the scribe had reached ἐναντίων and should have proceeded with εἰ γ', ὦ, his eye caught instead the similar-looking ἐγὼ of v. 1442, and the remaining three lines (1451—1453) were therefore at

be offered, that advice would vary in the two editions according to the temporary circumstances, unless it was merely a maxim of general application? The same reference to Cleocritus and Cinesias could hardly suit two distinct occasions in Athenian politics. It is therefore highly probable that we have in the text a clumsy blending of the two editions, and that the whole passage becomes clear if we write it thus—

ΔΙ. εἴπατον
περὶ τῆς πόλεως ἦντιν' ἔχεται σωτή-
ριαν.
EY. ἐγὼ μὲν οἶδα καὶ θέλω φράζειν. ΔΙ.
λέγε. 1442

Then followed—

Edition B (or A) vv. 1437—1441, 1451—1453 (eight lines).

EY. εἰ τις πτερώσας...
τῶν ἐναντίων.
ΔΙ. εἰ γ', ὦ Παλάμηδες,...
EY. ...τὰς δ' ὀξέδας κηφισοφῶν.

first accidentally omitted altogether. Being subsequently found unrepresented, they were written in, but at the wrong place.

[Though I am not sure that the very pronounced *nominativus pendens* of v. 1437 is unsound, I am inclined to suggest that an alteration in v. 1438 of αἰροῖεν αἶραι to ἀέριον ἄραι would be an easy and not unpleasing way of removing the difficulty. Of course ἄραι rather than the form ἄρειε is appropriate in the mouth of Euripides and in the same line with the 'tragic' πλάκα.]
T. G. TUCKER.

University of Melbourne.

NOTES ON CICERO PRO SESTIO.

§ 19. Capillo ita horrido ut Capua, in qua ipsa tum imaginis ornandae causa duumviratum gerebat, Sephasiam sublaturus videretur.

'Sublaturus' the common explanation 'prohibiturus ne in eo vico unguenta venderentur' seems very strained. It seems to me that the expression, if correct, is to be regarded as very fine sarcasm—he was so careless of his coiffure that you would think he intended to carry off all the barbers' shops, as Verres carried off works of art.

But I cannot help thinking that for

'sublaturus' we should read 'sublata rus' or 'rus sublata' and Sephasia.

'So ungroomed was he that it looked as though all the barbers' shops had been taken from Capua into the country.'

§ 24. quod ita domus fumabat, ut multa eius sermonis indicia redolerent.

The edd. suspect 'sermonis.' I am inclined to think it is right. But 'fumabat' and 'redolerent' must be taken quite literally. 'His kitchen chimney gave many savoury proofs of the philosophical disputation that

he was holding,' *i.e.* nihil esse praestabilis otiosa vita plena et conferta voluptatibus. § 23.

§ 24. id autem foedus meo sanguine ictum sanciri posse.

ictum is suspected.

It is defensible if we translate 'the treaty, if cemented by my blood, could be ratified,' *i.e.* take meo sanguine as instrumental ablative after 'ictum' not after 'sanciri.' This seems the intention of Halm's note.

Cf. Cic. in Pis. § 28.

Foedus quod meo sanguine in pactione provinciarum ieras.

§ 30. 'Nihil acerbius socii et Latini ferre soliti quam se ex urbe exire a consulibus juberi.'

Cf. in Catil. i. § 13 'Exire ex urbe jubet consul hostem' which expression has distinctly the air of an old political formula.

§ 72. ex iis princeps emitur ab inimicis meis is quem homines in luctu irridentes Gracchum vocabant, quoniam id etiam fatum civitatis fuit, ut illa ex vepreculis extracta nitedula rempublicam conaretur adrodere.

'Gracchum' is, I think, right. Like Gracchus, Numerius attacked the constitution.

But why does Cicero call him a 'nitedula'? Because, say the edd., his name was Rufus, and he was a 'rusticus.' Therefore he is connected with 'mus agrestis rubens.' Possibly there is a joke on the name Quintius which may suggest 'squeaking,' *cp. κοίτην* and the Greek transliteration of Quintius into Κοίτριος. It has been suggested to me in support of this that in the 'Testamentum Porcelli' the name of the pig testator's sister is Quirina. *Infra* in § 82 it is said of the same Numerius that, learning that he was to be murdered to serve his party's ends, 'messoria se corbe contexit. Cum quaererent alii Numerium alii Quintium gemini nominis errore servatus est.'

It is impossible to take the method of this escape seriously. Like a mouse he hid

himself in a corn basket. A reaper's basket cannot really have been big enough to hide a man.

But what is the meaning of 'gemini nominis errore'? Not surely the 'mistake arising from his having two names' but 'the mistake arising from his having two names that fitted into one another.'

They would be calling him in the vocative case Numeri-Quinti. People did not recognize that they were searching for anybody, but thought that they were shouting numbers connected with the distribution of corn. Numerius has hidden himself in a granary. See Forcellini (*de Vit*) s.v. numerus § 39, who quotes an inscription, late it is true, and adds 'numerus designare videtur vel personam cui data ex ordine tessera illa vel ostio (*sic* ? ostium) unde frumentum accipiebatur.'

§ 72. non ille Serranus ab aratro sed ex deserto gaviolaeliore† a calatis gaviis in Calatinos Atilios insitus. Read 'ex deserto gaviario,' on which a Greek gloss has been written *λαρείω*. Cicero is again punning on animal names. Gavia = *λάπος*. To take a parallel from Punch, we might say in English 'Mr. Hogg from the tumble-down piggery.'

'a calatis Gaviis' I should like to regard as a gloss of some kind, perhaps 'exoletis Gaviis'—it is certainly not wanted in the text, though it seems feeble to expunge it without a better explanation. Or possibly the gloss may have been *λάπος* a Latinis Gavia.

§ 131. cum ipsis Nonis Sextilibus idem dies adventus mei fuisset reditusque natalis, idem carissimae filiae, etc., etc. Edd. have obscured this passage by putting the comma after natalis. It should be placed after reditusque.

'The same fifth of August was the day of my arrival, back to Italy, the birthday too of my daughter, the anniversary of the colony of Brundisium, &c., &c.'

ERNEST I. ROBSON.

Sydney, March 1897.

MISCELLANEA.

Alcestis 320—322.—In the March number of the *Classical Review* (p. 107) Mr. St. George Stock criticises Professor Earle's treatment of this passage. Mr. Stock himself disposes somewhat summarily of the difficulty by reviving the old explanation,

according to which *Alcestis* is speaking on the first of the month, the day on which Death, like other creditors, comes to claim his due. This explanation is seemingly very easy; but in reality it is liable to serious objections, which Mr. Stock appears

to have overlooked. (1) The expression ἐς τρίτην μηνός, 'on (or rather "against") the third of the month,' is a very suspicious one. An Attic writer would have said εἰς τρίτην ἰσταμένον, or the like. I will not absolutely deny that ἐς τρίτην μηνός is a possible expression in verse; but *exempla desunt*; and until they are produced the soundness of the text must remain in question. (2) The day on which debts were paid at Athens seems to have been the last of the month (ἐνῇ καὶ νέα) rather than the first day of the month (νομηνία). It is true that Plutarch and other late writers mention the payment of debts on the νομηνία: but they wrote at a time when the Roman custom of paying on the Kalends had probably led to a change in the Greek usage. That the ἐνῇ καὶ νέα was the usual day for settling accounts at Athens is clear from the *Clouds* of Aristophanes, from Lysias *against Panceleon* 6, and other passages too numerous to mention. For

these reasons it seems probable that the text is corrupt. Whether Kvčala's emendation, which Professor Earle accepts, is the right one, is another matter.

C.I.A. ii. 3961, 2.—αὐτὸ δ' οὐ παραδείξει ἀφείλετο δαίμονος αἶσα. The sense and syntax of this line have not been clear to editors (see for example Kaibel, *Epig. Gr.* 87; Hoffmann, *Sylloge*, 40). I would read, without changing a letter, αὐτὸ δ' οὐ πάρα δείξαι ἀφείλετο δαίμονος αἶσα, etc. The construction then becomes perfectly simple.

Horace *Sat.* i. 8, 39.—*Iulius et fragilis Pediatia furque Voranus*. *Iulius* is clearly wrong, as no member of the Julian family would be mentioned by Horace in this contemptuous way. Read *Tillius*, and compare *Sat.* vi. 107-9. The change from *Iulius* to *Tillius* is palaeographically very easy.

H. W. HAYLEY.

Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.

NOTE ON CICERO AD ATTICUM, V. 19. 2.

FILIOLAM tuam tibi iam + Romae iucundam esse gaudeo, eamque, quam nunquam vidi, tamen et amo et amabilem esse certo scio.

Nearly all editors place this passage beside Att. vii. 2, 4 *Filiola tua te delectari laetor et probari tibi φρονικὴν esse τὴν πρὸς τὰ τέκνα*. Lehmann, accordingly, suggests *amore* or *natura*. Rather we should read ὁρμη 'by a natural instinct.' In the language of the Stoical philosophy ὁρμη was the regular word for the natural instincts

cp. Fin. iv. 39 *Naturalem appetitionem, quam vocant ὁρμὴν*: Off. ii. 18 *appetitiones quas illi ὁρμᾶς* (sc. *nominant*). Written in Roman characters, as the word often is in MSS. (e.g. N.D. ii. 58; *Fin.* iii. 23), it might readily have been corrupted into *Rome*, a mere transposition of letters. Such transpositions are frequent in the Medicean, e.g. Att. v. 12. 3, *alterum* for *laterum*; vii. 13. 3, *scripti* for *scripsit*.

L. C. PURSER.

FRONTO AND PLUTARCH.

IN the article on Fronto, the tutor of Marcus Aurelius, in Smith's Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography, Professor William Ramsay says: 'the story that he was descended by the mother's side from Plutarch is a mere modern fabrication.' These words are apparently taken [from a remark of Niebuhr in his edition of Fronto (p. xxv.) that this story 'recentioris aetatis commentum est.' Niebuhr adds 'Auctorem citant Joannem Saresberiensem, sed parum

attente lectum; nam Sextum cum Frontone confundunt.' It seems however to have been Niebuhr himself who was guilty of reading John of Salisbury 'parum attente.' He had doubtless observed that a passage, *Policraticus* viii. 19, which mentions Fronto, contained the words 'Institutus est (sc. M. Antoninus) ad philosophiam per Apollonium Chalcedonensem, ad scientiam litterarum Graecarum per Chaeronensem Plutarchi nepotem.' The grandson of Plutarch here

meant is of course Sextus; but John proceeds: 'Latinas autem eum Fronto, nobilissimus orator, docuit, et pro quorundam opinione Plutarchi nepos.' And above, *Polier*. viii. 13, he says of Seneca: 'eum Fronto, secundum quosdam nepos Plutarchi, cujus meminit in primo Juvenalis.' John thus certainly distinguished Fronto from Sextus and made both (but the former doubtfully) the grandsons of Plutarch. What the origin of this report concerning Fronto may have been, I do not know. But it is worth observing that the passage which I have last quoted appears to contain a fragment of Fronto, for after quoting *Juv.* i. 12 John continues thus: 'semper eum (sc. Senecam), inquam, sic asserit (sc. Fronto) universos exterminare errores, ut aurea videatur saecula reformare, et deos ab humano genere exulantes, ejus opera revocatos, hominibus contractos societate miscere.' Mai (Fronto ed. 1846 p. xxxv.) says 'Fallitur Saresberiensis quod adinet ad Frontonis cognationem, nam Juvenalis de antiquiore Frontone loquitur. Reliqua

autem quo pacto dicere potuerit S. nisi Frontonem de Seneca scribentem legerit, eruditi dispicient.' Niebuhr supposes Juvenal's Fronto to be one Fronto Catus, mentioned by Pliny; we do not know that he was related to Plutarch; but we have some reason for thinking him to have been related to the tutor of Marcus Aurelius. See Mayor ad *Juv.* i. 12, and Buttman's note given in Naber's ed. of Fronto p. 23. In what we have of the later Fronto, he speaks of Seneca only to attack him (ed. Naber pp. 155, 156, 224). See Mai's note, ed. 1846 p. 174.

Mai's references to John of Salisbury are deliberately passed over by Naber; but they deserve more attention than they received. The origin of John's statement, whatever it may be worth, remains unexplained. The curious passages in Appuleius (*Metam.* i. 12, ii. 3) where his hero's descent from Plutarch is mentioned, should not be forgotten in this connection.

CLEMENT C. J. WEBB.

NOTAE TIRONIANAE ATTRIBUTED TO ST. CYPRIAN.

ALL the writers on this subject refer to an assertion of Trithemius, which is quoted in Hartel's preface to Cyprian p. lxxviii., to the effect that he had found a large collection of *notae* bearing the name of Cyprian. This collection has not been seen or heard of since. But in MS. 131 of New College, Oxford, at the end of a large collection of Cyprianic writings, genuine and spurious, there stands a short collection of *notae* headed *quaedam scripturarum notae apud celeberrimos auctores fuerunt quasque antiqui ad distinctionem scripturarum carminibus et historiis apposuerunt*. It occupies f. 119b—120b of the MS., which is of the 15th century and resembles, on the whole, Hartel's B. The contents are accurately enough described in the words of Trithemius, *primo characteres sive notae, postea dictiones per eosdem characteres designatae, ita quod dictio quaevis per notam sibi significatur praepositam*. The latest writer who mentions the matter, v. Dobschütz in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 1897, column 136, casts

doubt on Cyprian's authorship, reasonably enough, and also on the honesty of Trithemius. But a sixteenth century scholar might well be misled by the position of this document at the end of the Cyprianic writings. It is true that the MS. does not assign it to Cyprian, but as much may be said of other writings attributed with more or less probability to him and printed to this day in the editions. So few of the MSS. of Cyprian's epistles have been examined, or at least so few have been described, that somewhere in Germany there may be found one containing the same *notae* in the same place. This would save Trithemius' reputation to some extent. He is not likely to have invented the connection between Cyprian and the *notae*; and yet his assertion would be, at the best, a monstrous exaggeration. I have no knowledge of the subject of *notae Tironianae*, and had no time to examine this collection. It might be worthy of the attention of some student.

E. W. WATSON.

THE GENITIVE Πασιάδαο.

PROFESSOR ALLEN has kindly communicated to me a suggestion that the Pasiades inscription (cf. May number, p. 190) may after all not be strictly prose, but rather a brief specimen of sepulchral verse like those cited in his *Greek Versification in Inscriptions*, p. 43 *infra*, with a prose addition by the sculptor. This would explain what had seemed strange to me, namely, the appearance of the uncontracted genitive in the face of the contracted forms of other Doric dialects from the earliest period, and even on some

Rhodian inscriptions which it was difficult to date much, if any, later than that of Pasiades. As for the *ς*, though one of the objections to the explanation of Blass would thus be removed, the mere fact of a second occurrence on an inscription of any sort by another individual militates strongly enough against the view of Blass to make another explanation, such as I have given, well worth considering.

CARL D. BUCK.

University of Chicago.

MARULLUS'S TEXT OF LUCRETII.

THE Bibliothèque Nationale contains a copy of the Venice edition of Lucretius, filled with MS. corrections. Some later owner of the book prefixes a note which appears to mean that these readings are due to Pontanus, but students of Lucretius will be interested to know that this volume contains not the text of Pontanus but a very complete copy of the readings of Marullus.

Three hands are apparent in these notes. The first, to which the great bulk of the notes are due, is that of a scholar, with letters finely formed. The second hand has supplemented these largely in the first and second books. Evidently both writers had before them Marullus' readings in manuscript. I think it probable that the additions by the second hand were made after Marullus' death. But the chief interest attaches to the third hand: the strong and decided characters indicate one who was a man of action as well as a scholar. At vi. 357:—

autumnoque magis stellis fulgentibus apta
concutitur caeli domus,

this writer adds:—

Pe. Monachus ex homeri εἰς ἱλιάδος ἀστέρες
ὁπωρινῶ ἐναλίγκιον.

and immediately below he corrects *ventique calores* thus:—

Puto legendum. Ventique calore.

See Munro here. The writer of this note in the first person was unquestionably Marullus himself. Throughout this volume he has most carefully revised the readings of the first hand, frequently correcting them as well as adding fresh ones, including many which are not mentioned by Munro. The Petrus Monachus who suggested the parallel from Homer, if not the same person, was probably a near relation of the Severus Monachus from whom Pius (editor of the Bologna edition of 1511) borrowed a copy of Marullus' readings; *exemplar mira industria castigatum* he calls it.

J. MASSON.

PARIS, June 10th, 1897.

POSTGATE'S *SILVA MANILIANA*.

Silva Maniliana. Congessit JOH. P. POSTGATE.
Cantabrigiae, MDCCCLXXXVII. 3s. net.

A BOOK like this, which consists almost wholly of particular emendations in the text

of Manilius, does not easily admit of any general criticism: but as it will be my business to say most about those emendations which please me least, I will begin by observing that Dr. Postgate's work is as clever

as it is painstaking, and that, while his suggestions are generally bold and sometimes brilliant, he nevertheless displays a proper reverence for manuscript readings in almost every case where such an attitude is consistent with self-respect. For his acquaintance with these readings he is indebted to the as yet unpublished researches of Bechert, except so far as concerns the Madrid manuscript lately made known to the readers of the *Classical Review* by Prof. Robinson Ellis. One could wish that Dr. Postgate had allowed himself to discourse at greater length on the merits of a poet so little known and so well deserving to be known as Manilius, the more so because the remark made by Prof. Ellis (*Noctes Manilianae*, ix.) that the subject is adequately treated by Mr. G. A. Simcox in his *History of Latin Literature*, is scarcely accurate. The astounding statement of Mr. Simcox, that 'it would be unfair to say that the poem is on astrology, for the distinction between astronomy and astrology did not yet exist,' which one would have thought was sufficiently refuted many times over by Manilius himself, is the most striking, but unhappily not the only proof that the learned critic has here ventured upon wholly unfamiliar ground. Dr. Postgate's few remarks on the literary pretensions of Manilius seem to me altogether admirable, except in the choice of passages given in illustration. It is strange that any one should be reminded of Milton by the commonplace lines in which Manilius sings the praises of the Milky Way. The remark that this phenomenon 'resupina facit mortalibus ora,' which so deeply impresses Dr. Postgate, will in others merely induce a feeling of regret that the poet himself should not have been more often thus affected. For Manilius, unlike the blind Milton, was almost wholly unacquainted with the face of the sky. I would also protest against Dr. Postgate's proposal (p. 32) to omit two lines from the fine passage at the beginning of the fourth book. They are certainly in the Manilian manner; and if they are not quite so good as their immediate neighbours, why should they be? On the other hand it would be difficult to sum up some of the poet's characteristics better than Dr. Postgate has done in the words: 'Is est scriptor qui ardua et abstrusa planius et facilius quam communia et in medio jacentia argumenta tractet.' Has not he forgotten his own words when he asks us to transpose lines 426 and 427 of the second book? To me they seem much more Manilian in the old arrangement.

Dr. Postgate begins his inquiry 'de locis spurii et suspectis' with a somewhat extravagant panegyric on Bentley, invoking Hercules to witness that if that famous scholar had been always at his best in his Manilian lucubrations there would have been little left for any one else to do. Unfortunately, or—seeing how much actually has been left for Dr. Postgate—fortunately, Bentley was as often at his very worst. Sometimes he treated the verses of the unfortunate poet as a careless master might those of an ambitious pupil whose imperfect attempts at utterance he is at no pains to understand, while he labelled lines everywhere as spurious to an extent which even Dr. Postgate allows to be impossible. I do not doubt that, in the Elysian fields, Manilius has long since introduced himself—by his real name—to Huet, or even that, after some delay, he has been persuaded to shake hands with Scaliger. But I cannot believe that he is on speaking terms with Bentley.

Take the passage which Dr. Postgate selects as a proof of Bentley's wisdom—he might fairly, on his theory, have called it infallibility. At II. 232—of Jacob's edition—the line

Parsque marina nitens semper fundentis
Aquari

comes very awkwardly, and though I cannot think, with Dr. Postgate, that it is untranslatable, neither can I hold, with Professor Ellis, that it is necessary to the context. But after IV. 489 some mention of Aquarius undoubtedly is necessary. Thither therefore Bentley transferred the line, changing it 'en route' into 'Pars est prima nocens humentis semper Aquari.' And Dr. Postgate, merely doubting about the substitution of 'humensis' for 'fundentis,' pronounces the rest 'certissima.' Surely this would be hyperbolic even if the line had borne transposition in its original shape.

Here however Bentley is at any rate brilliant. Turn now to p. 5 of Dr. Postgate. The poet, after mentioning the constellation Ara, proceeds:—

Quam propter Cetus convolvens squamea
terga
Orbis insurgit tortis, et fluctuat alvo.
Intentans morsum, similis jam jamque tenenti,
Qualis ad expositae fatum Cepheidos, &c.
I. 433, *sqq.*

Bentley, with the remark 'Atqui tam

similis est tenenti Andromedam quam qui dimidio coelo ab ea distet, struck out line 435; but afterwards suggested that it might be allowed to come back, not into the first book, but the fifth, if it would consent to apply, not to the Whale and Andromeda, but to Canis Major and the Hare. And Dr. Postgate, while venturing to deprecate such extreme severity, hastens to observe that Bentley has spoken 'rectissime ad rem.' He has done nothing of the kind. In the first place Andromeda and Cetus are not half, nor a quarter, nor yet an eighth of the sky apart, and they are seen on the meridian at the same time. Secondly, the passage, as Bentley, who refers to Cicero's 'Aratea,' ought to have known, is merely an imitation of what Aratus wrote, not about the Dog, but about the Whale. And thirdly, Dr. Postgate has apparently failed to notice that Bentley, while thus straining at a gnat, has swallowed an enormous camel in accepting the words 'quam propter.' Here is a poet who actually states that the Whale is side by side with the Altar—he probably found the names next to each other in a list of constellations—yet we are not to suppose he could depart so far from the truth as to suggest—he does not say—that the Whale is near to Andromeda.

Turn next to II. 70, *sqq.* (p. 7). ['But for Providential guidance']

*Non esset statio terris, non ambitus astris,
Haereretque vagus mundus, standoque
rigeret,
Nec sua dispositos servarent sidera cursus,
Noxque alterna diem fugeret rursumque
fugaret.*

That Dr. Postgate would have failed to understand 71 unless Bentley had said it was meaningless I cannot believe, nor is it easy to suppose that Bentley would have said this, had the line not borne witness against a correction of his own. Bentley took offence, as he well might, at 'sua' in 72, and proposed to substitute 'vaga.' Then, as I conceive, he noticed that 'vagus' occurred in the line before, and therefore struck out that presumptuous line, declaring that only a drunkard or a madman could make 'vagus' an epithet for 'totus mundus.' But why should not the sky—and 'mundus' is the usual Manilian for 'sky'—be called fleeting, as opposed to the stationary earth? Just below, in line 78, we have 'coelum' made 'volare'; besides, if we read with Dr. Postgate, 'erraretque vagus mundus, standove rigeret'—'the sky would wander

NO. XCVIII. VOL. XI.

at random'—we suddenly break the line of thought into which the preceding verse has brought us. The stars would not go round because the sky is not wandering, but sticking fast. Line 72 Dr. Postgate would apparently strike out altogether, observing rather strangely that Bentley's emendation is unnecessarily bold, since "'sua" pro "ejus" positum falsarium arguit.' If 'vaga' be the right reading this argument disappears. But it is surely clear that we cannot possibly drop this line altogether, since its 'nec' is absolutely necessary to make sense of the line which follows. Dr. Postgate would make the passage mean, 'But for Providence, night would alternately chase and flee from day.' Surely this is exactly what night, under Providence, does.

It is Bentley again who has led Dr. Postgate (p. 7) to assault the unoffending lines describing the plague of Athens, I. 889-90.

*Lassus defecerat ignis,
Et coacervatis ardebant corpora membris.*

Here Dr. Postgate alters 'et' to 'nec,' asking with Bentley how the bodies were burnt if the fire had failed. Is not this a little prosaic? To me the lines seem a very natural rendering of the passage in Thuc. II. 52, which says that people whose means of providing funerals were exhausted took to heaping their dead on the pyres provided for those of their neighbours.

In another place (p. 37) Dr. Postgate, again beguiled by Bentley, has certainly gone further wrong than his tempter. At IV. 204, etc. we read

*Librantes noctem Chelae cum tempore lucis,
Per nova maturi post annum munera Bacchi,
Mensurae tribuent usus ac pondera rerum.*

Bentley was pleased to alter line 205 into 'cum nova maturi gustamus munera Bacchi.' Dr. Postgate displays a good deal of ingenuity in arguing that he should have left it out altogether. 'Quid enim,' he asks, 'ad Libram pertinent ista Bacchi munera?' Well, at III. 662 we read that (cum refulget)

*Libra diem noctesque pari cum foedere
ducens....
Tum Liber gravida descendit plenus ab ulmo,*

and at II. 658-9,

*Ver aries, Cererem cancer, Bacchumque
ministrans
Libra...*

B B

The Greek vintage was in fact supposed to be heralded by the heliacal rising of the star ϵ Virginis, Προσπυγήτης. I do not suppose that the new wine was tasted immediately, as Bentley has it. But is 'post annum' really so difficult? may it not answer, as Scaliger said, to περιπλομένου ἐνιαυτού?

On the passage II. 70, *sqq.* above discussed Dr. Postgate truly observes that the presence of 'vagus' and 'vaga' in two consecutive lines is not in itself fatal to Bentley's correction, since 'hujusmodi permuta apud veteres reperiuntur.' This remark somewhat weakens his own objection to the repetition—in a different sense—of 'cum luna' in I. 469, *sqq.* (p. 21)—

Praecipue medio cum luna implebitur orbe
Certa nitent mundo; cum luna conditur
omne Stellarum vulgus.

If it be thought impossible that 'cum luna' can mean 'when in company with the moon,' yet a good sense can be easily obtained by placing the semicolon after these words instead of before. Dr. Postgate however conjectures 'tum lunae,' in the sense 'made to disappear by the moon,' a use of the dative which I can find no reason for thinking was as dear to the poet as it is to his latest commentator. We are here bidden to turn to p. 8, where we find the very difficult passage II. 533, *sqq.* thus restored by Dr. Postgate:

Ipse suae parti Centaurus tergoce cedit;
Usque adeo est homini victus. Quid mirer
ab illis
Nascentis Librae superari posse trigonum?

Here Dr. Postgate has got a dative in every line, whereas the usual reading has 'partis' and 'hominis' certainly genitives, with Librae in any case out of which a sense can be extracted. As the sense even of Dr. Postgate's version perhaps does not lie quite upon the surface, I may observe that the context leaves no doubt of the general meaning, which is that the triangle Aries, Leo, and Sagittarius is less powerful than that of Libra, Aquarius, and Gemini, because in the former two and a half parts out of three are bestial, whereas the latter is wholly human. (This theory is not without some antiquarian interest, seeing that to the earlier Greek writers invariably, and often to Manilius himself, the seventh sign is, not Libra at all, but Chelae, the Claws of the Scorpion.) And Dr. Postgate's translation

will be somewhat as follows: 'The Centaur himself [*i.e.* Sagittarius] yields to a part of himself [*sc.* the human] in virtue of his [equine] back. To this extent is he overcome by man (homine minor est). Why should I wonder that the triangle of him that is born of them (*sc.* Aries, Leo, and Sagittarius) can be overcome by Libra?' To get the difficult 'nascentis' out of its apparent agreement with 'Librae' is no doubt an advantage. Still it would be easier to believe in the existence of two such datives in two consecutive lines if any of the undisputed Manilian parallels offered by Dr. Postgate came near them in difficulty. But surely the hardest of these, as 'terrae remissi' in I. 759, well rendered by Prof. Ellis 'excused the earth,' are easy by the side of 'homini victus.'

The courage which has here stimulated Dr. Postgate to advocate the reading of two, if not three, well-nigh untranslatable lines running is again conspicuous in his assault (p. 11) on the very mysterious passage, II. 943, *sqq.*—

Haec tua templa ferunt Maia, Cyllenie, nate,
O facies signata nota, quod nomen et ipsi
Auctores tibi dant artis quae ducit Olympum.

This differs practically from the reading of the Gembloux MS. only by the substitution of 'artis' for 'artes,' and of 'quae' for 'qua.' Dr. Postgate admits that, like all other commentators, he has not the least idea what the poet is here talking about. Yet he has made up his mind that the words 'quod nomen—artis' are to be bracketed as a gloss. Bentley pronounced both 944 and 945, because unintelligible to him, an interpolation, on which Dr. Postgate, reminding us that 'cuckoo' is one of Bentley's names for an interpolator, observes quaintly, if not very logically, that in that case the author of the gloss would be a cuckoo which has laid in a cuckoo's nest. But is it quite reasonable to pronounce any part of a sentence to be superfluous before one knows what the rest of the sentence means? Dr. Postgate's attempt at partial explanation is perhaps suggested by a conjecture of Jacob's, that O is not an interjection, but the symbol of Mercury. Against that conjecture it may be urged, first that a word does not become a monosyllable because it is written in short-hand, secondly that, as Letronne fifty years ago maintained, there is no reason to think the planetary symbols are as old as Manilius—I am not sure that Dr. Postgate (p. 58) does not seem to hold a contrary opinion—and thirdly that Jacob, undetected by Professor Ellis, has mistaken the symbol of Venus for

that of Mercury. His suggestion however prepares us in some degree for Dr. Postgate's startling rendering: 'Marked with the letter O, which is the first in the word Olympus.' Brilliant as this is, I confess it does not strike me as convincing, and most people probably will prefer to follow Prof. Ellis in regarding O as an interjection. It is not unknown in this latter sense to the poets.

Having seen how Dr. Postgate can lead a forlorn hope against what may well appear impregnable fortresses, we shall be prepared to behold him next as a conqueror. He is at his very best in his treatment of the long passage (III. 590-617) which explains how much life is promised to a child by the position of the moon in this or that of the celestial 'houses' at the time of birth. In the lines as usually read a certain principle of order is discernible, the more fortunate houses promising longer lives than the less; but there are some strange intervals and at least one obvious exception. As amended by Dr. Postgate (p. 30, &c.) the passage loses its difficulty, and displays a coherence and regularity worthy a better subject. The alterations by which this happy result is achieved are few and beautifully simple. The most striking of them, which replaces 'mensibus' by 'messibus'—so many harvests in the sense of so many years—is suggested by a passage in Martial (VI. 28, 8) which, curiously enough, also supplies Dr. Postgate with an unexpected confirmation of another reading in the same lines. We get also a final settlement of the question whether he who 'ter vicenos geminat, tres abstrahit annos' makes 117 or 57, as to which, by the way, Dr. Postgate is mistaken in saying that Scaliger got the wrong answer.

I would now ask whether, if we admit the probability that Manilius here ought to have written what Dr. Postgate sets before us, we should also draw the inference that he did so write. I myself think we should, because the poet, who loved figures as few poets have loved them, would have had in this case only a row of figures to copy. The case would be very different were astrological doctrine in question. We see that Manilius not only made grievous blunders in his astronomy, but sometimes endeavoured to follow two incompatible systems at once; and if we knew more of pre-Manilian astrology, we should probably find, as M. Lanson has so well urged, that he was here just as often in error. When therefore Dr. Postgate (p. 35) proposes a trifling correction 'ne secum pugnet Manilius,' the plea seems to

me inadequate. And for this reason, among others, I strongly dissent from his plausible interpretation (p. 29) of the difficult passage III. 545, *sqq.*

It is here laid down that the first year, month, day, and hour of a man's life are influenced by the sign rising at the moment of birth, the succeeding years, months, days, and hours by the succeeding signs in order. Hence in later life a great—perhaps convenient—confusion of influences, as the shorter seasons run through the signs so much faster than the longer:

Venit omnis ad astrum

Hora die bis, mense dies semel, unus in
anno,
Mensis, et exactis bis sex jam solibus
annus.

Thus the passage is generally written, and thus written it can, as Huet showed, be interpreted easily enough after a fashion. As to the two last clauses there is no difficulty, and never would have been any had not Bentley inserted a perfectly imbecile correction which every one has disregarded. The first clauses, says Huet, signify that every hour comes twice a day to the sign, because in every twenty-four hours the same hour occurs twice, once by day and once by night. But the day only comes to it once a month, because no day in a month is ever repeated. It is clear that this facile solution satisfies only the letter. We want to know what day of our life it is, not what day in a particular month, and though the first day of a month does not recur, yet the thirteenth and twenty-fifth days of that month will be under the same sign as the first: in fact, the sign goes round among the days of the month, not once, but three times, or twice at the least. Dr. Postgate's proposal is that of Dufay, to place the comma, not after 'semel,' but before, making 'bis' refer alike to hour and day. 'Nam cum XII signa sint, bis (ut duce Manilio numerum ponam, partes neglegam) singulis mensibus ad idem reditur astrum.' Here however I would remind him of his own admirable remark that 'in arithmetice subtilis atque intricatas rationes nemo magis luculenter versibus exponit' than Manilius, whose metrical numbers in fact never flow more smoothly than when he has arithmetical numbers to express. That a poet who (I. 547) did not allow himself so much poetical license as to say that the circumference of a circle is just three times the diameter, would condescend to say 'twice' when the truth lies nearer to thrice, I cannot

believe. Nor do I think that his words can fairly be made to bear such a meaning. 'Venit omnis ad astrum hora, &c.' can only signify 'every hour comes twice a day to the sign.' This no doubt is much the same thing as to say that every sign comes twice to an hour. But though it might be true to say that every sign comes twice—or thrice—a month to a day, it is not equally true to say that every day comes twice or thrice to a sign. Yet this is really what Dr. Postgate makes Manilius say. I think therefore that Huet has rightly interpreted the poet's meaning, however unsatisfactory it may be. How much blame should rest on him and how much on his authorities it would be hard to decide; but he has himself supplied evidence that ancient astrologers were not always careful to be mathematically correct. About this doctrine, however, he cannot have cared much, as he has, a few lines before, mentioned with apparent approval another quite inconsistent with it; and it is possible he did not know much. Where and when was it invented? With the aid of the Julian calendar the calculations required by it are made easily enough. But to Greeks and Babylonians, who kept their months by the moon, there were not always twelve months in the year; to Egyptians, who broke the sequence of months each year by the intercalation of five days which belonged to no month, it is hard to see how it can have commended itself. Probably Manilius was here, as in many other places, out of his depth.

¶ Having said so much about the transposition of a comma, I will devote the rest of my remarks to passages in which the question is at any rate of words. At IV. 817, *sgg.* (pp. 42–44) is a long disquisition on what Manilius calls 'ecliptica signa,' those, that is, in which for the time being lunar eclipses take place, and which consequently themselves lose their vigour. It may be considered an astrological statement of the facts that the moon's nodes move from east to west, and that when the ascending node is in any sign the descending will be in the opposite. Lines 848, 849, according to the Gembloux manuscript, run as follows:

*Ipsa docent titulos causae quae ecliptica
signa
Dixere antiqui, pariter sed bina laborant.*

Something of course must be done to 848. Bentley did it easily by leaving out 'quae'; but as Prof. Ellis observes, the word can hardly have got into many MSS. without reason. Dr. Postgate would take the bold

course of leaving out still more, and reading

Ipsa docent tituli causas; sed bina laborant.

It is true that, as he says, the words 'quae ecliptica' &c. only repeat what has been said before, but it was a great many lines before, and supposing them to be merely a gloss, it is hard to see why 'pariter' should also have been repeated from quite another part of the passage. Moreover it seems to me that something to explain 'tituli' is required at this point. Would it not be possible to make 'ipsa' nominative to 'lugent' in the line before, and borrowing a hint from Prof. Ellis read the passage:

*Et velut elatam Phoebe in funere lugent
Ipsa (docet titulus causas) quae ecliptica &c.?*

A little further on, it seems to me that Dr. Postgate, or his predecessors, create a difficulty. Manilius goes on to say, 860, *sgg.*

*Tum vicina labant ipsis haerentia signis
Quae prius in terras veniunt terrasque re-
linquunt,
Sidereo non ut pugnet contrarius orbi,
Sed qua mundus agit cursus inclinat et
ipse, &c.*

Dr. Postgate insists that one or more lines must have been lost after 861, as otherwise what follows is without meaning. He allows that, even if we do not read 'orbis' in 862, the word must be understood in agreement to 'contrarius.' If so, I cannot see wherein the difficulty lies. The next to fail are the pair of signs immediately to the west, says Manilius, 'not in such a way that the revolution (sc. of the nodes) should be contrary to that of the (fixed) stars; but as the heaven directs its course, so it too inclines' &c. I am aware that Scaliger, and apparently Pingré, understand 'orbis' to mean the earth; and possibly Dr. Postgate does so too. But if so, these lines and those that follow seem to me to have absolutely no meaning at all.

Another gap is suspected by Dr. Postgate, p. 49, in that part of the fifth book, so interesting from a literary and so outrageous from an astronomical point of view, where Manilius discusses the powers of the constellations which rise with successive degrees of the ecliptic. The common reading—V. 338—attributes certain effects to

*Lyra, quae cornua ducet ad astra
Chelarum surget cum pars vicesima sexta.*

After which we go on to stars that rise with the Scorpion. Dr. Postgate, reading 'ducit,' places a full stop after 'astra,' and supposes that after 339 many lines have been lost in which the influences of some star rising with the 26th degree of Libra were given. His remark that the poet has undertaken in this fifth book to tell us several things of which we hear no more, though true, is not conclusive, since Manilius, whose work as a treatise on astrology is manifestly incomplete, has made other unfulfilled promises. The whole passage however is chaotic, and line 340, which should mention the Scorpion, does so only in virtue of a restoration by Scaliger, which, though displaying, as Jacob says, a divine ingenuity, is after all the work of a mortal. But I cannot think that Dr. Postgate has hit on the right solution. In the first place, it is hard to believe that the abrupt and superfluous phrase, 'quae cornu ducit ad astra,' can be the end of a sentence, especially as the reading of the best MSS. is 'ducet,' the future tense obviously demanding some continuation. Secondly, this part of Book V. cannot be fully discussed without some reference to the similar passages in the eighth book of Firmicus. That this fourth-century writer here copied Manilius has often been supposed, and Prof. Ellis—*Noct. Manil.* 225, *sqq.*—seems to consider it certain, though, if so, Firmicus, as it appears to me, got at least twice very near a deliberate falsehood. Now if we compare the two writers, one thing, I think, is clear, that Firmicus, if Manilius was the source of his information, had before him more of Manilius than has come down to us. And therefore,

if there is such a gap in Manilius as Dr. Postgate here supposes, we might reasonably hope to find it filled up in Firmicus. But Firmicus has no star rising with the 26th degree of Libra.

As however Dr. Postgate has written a short appendix to say what, in his opinion, that star should be, I should like to urge, in a still shorter one, that Manilius be held innocent until he is proved guilty. That the man who made the Hyades rise with the 27th degree of Aries was capable of anything, must be admitted: still without evidence we have no right to suspect that he made Antares rise with the 26th degree of Libra. The star was in his time almost at the middle of the sign Scorpio, and is several degrees south of the ecliptic.

Dr. Postgate however has, in other respects, deserved well of Manilius, whom he treats throughout, not merely as a fellow-creature, but as one who, with all his faults, was much more richly endowed than most of us. What could be simpler and cleverer than his corrections of 'Nave agit' for 'navigat' in IV. 173, or 'genius' for 'censum' in II. 889? I cannot myself feel strongly convinced by Dr. Postgate's learned arguments—pp. 46-48, &c.—to prove that our poet was greatly influenced by Propertius; but were it established it would be a pleasant addition to our knowledge, or rather illumination of our ignorance, concerning the man we call Manilius—Prof. Ellis has done all that can be done towards proving that he called himself so.

E. J. WEBB.

HOGARTH'S PHILIP AND ALEXANDER OF MACEDON.

Philip and Alexander of Macedon. By D. G. HOGARTH. With maps and illustrations. Pp. 1-305. Price 14s. Murray.

Nothing is more difficult than to reconstitute satisfactorily the character or the unvaried plans of the great men of antiquity. The facts may be pretty well established; the dates may be in process of continual correction; the minds of the men never become any better known, or, if a modern enquirer does happen really to think their thoughts, he can seldom prove his ideas to himself, and still less often can he do so to others. We know how hard it is to be sure what our own

friends are thinking or even doing; harder still is it to enter into the minds of living statesmen; hardest it is and always must be to be sure about statesmen dead and divided from us by a gulf which looks deeper and deeper the longer we gaze into it. Our ability to see something which, if not true, is at least possible, reasonable, and consistent, is greatest when we have letters of the great men or Plutarch's more or less sympathetic biographies. But ancient letters, not very often forthcoming at all, are rarely so well guaranteed as Cicero's, and even the heroes of Plutarch are often the subject of bitter modern dispute as to their

character and plans. In the case of Alexander of Macedon there is a fairly full biography to go upon; Arrian, Quintus Curtius, Justin, and Diodoros give us connected facts; and Mr. Hogarth follows Pridik in accepting certain letters as at least partly genuine. But even about Alexander, Grote and Niebuhr differed strangely from Droysen and Freeman. The tolerably favourable view of the great conqueror which Holm takes in his recent *Griechische Geschichte* (now in process of being translated into English) and the rather brief and dogmatic account of him and his works in B. Niese's *Gesch. d. griechischen und makedonischen Staaten* do not disguise the existence of serious differences of opinion among modern historians on fundamental points and of important difficulties in the recorded evidence. About Philip II., on the other hand, the evidence at our command, while it is singularly fragmentary and hostile, does not give us authentic papers, or enough of them to reveal anything of the king's mind, and does not include the judgment of anyone whose opinion we can, after weighing his date and circumstances, value at all highly. Perhaps it is for this reason that Philip 'supplies the central figure to no extant biography.'

Mr. Hogarth, then, has set himself a task of no small difficulty in reconstructing the character and views of both men, and, oddly enough, he has succeeded best with the more difficult half. His Alexander somehow does not appear so real and so alive as his Philip. Yet the living reality of his Philip, we must not forget, is gained by taking a free hand in dealing with him. This is no blame to Mr. Hogarth. Whoever writes of Philip needs must, if he means to be read, take a free hand and insert a great deal of matter of his own finding. The evidence about this king is so deficient and in such a state that it can only be eked out and made coherent by boldly laying down what we *think* is the probable view of his character. The writer must reconstitute that character confidently, though with insufficient means, or he must leave Philip an incomprehensible and not very interesting person,—not personality. Mr. Hogarth has the courage required, and he often carries us with him in what he assumes. We are not indeed sure about the following judgment:—

'The width of his [Philip's] sympathies, coupled with a radical insincerity of character, enabled him to adapt himself to all things and all men—to talk with Aristotle, or to drink to excess of good fellowship with bores and braves.'

If we know anything at all about Philip, we know that he could drink hard,—and a good thing too for a man in his position,—but the 'radical insincerity' of character is not so certain. Radically insincere men are generally found out and do not achieve great results. The king's plans however and their gradual growth can hardly be more plausibly conceived and set forth than by Mr. Hogarth. Studies in modern history and observations of modern times have helped him, we suspect, hardly less than reading of ancient authorities; but this only means the importation into the writing of history of a practical element which it has too often wanted: and his interpretation of Philip's ideas gains liveliness and probability by notions which he has probably drawn from watching Italy and the modern history of the Balkan Peninsula.

'Few men have seen so surely as Philip the faults of a dying order, and set themselves so consciously to create a new.' The day of city states was over. The time and the opportunity had come for a nation; and, if a nation has not grown up insensibly and come into being unobserved, the best or perhaps the only way to extemporize national feeling is through an army. Common service creates a common flag, a common feeling, a common king, and even a common language. There was a good fighting nucleus in the oldest Macedonia; there was good stuff among her dependencies, if only it could be induced to fight for and not against the suzerain; great prizes might reward the military effort forthwith and great results must follow later if a national Macedonian army could be created and used. Subsidiary to this effort must be the development of improvements in weapons, tactics, and strategy. Kill and make room to grow; grow together and grow outward. This comprises the essence of Philip's measures. How far forward the king saw, how many present prizes and future results he reckoned on at the outset it would be rash to say. He must have been less clever than we think him if he could not extend his ideas when his first successes were won and his means increased.

'Philip's claim to rank among great creative statesmen is not that he foreknew all the ultimate results of his action, but that he seized in their inception and directed successive developments. Both his ideal, and his knowledge of the means to attain it, grew with the growth of events. If in 358 it did not rise above the consolidation of the military strength of Macedonia, and chance in the main made him the creator of Macedonian political unity, it is very certain that he had come to be possessed by a

clear conception even of the unification of all Hellas, when he spent his last two years in enlisting the Greeks for common service with Macedonians in a great war.'

Here Mr. Hogarth has the advantage of Holm in plausibility. Holm carries back the schemes for unifying Hellas and conquering Asia almost to the beginning of Philip's reign; but it is improbable that a prince whose position was small and also uncertain could aspire to so much. *L'appétit vient en mangeant*.

Mr. Hogarth is no less convincing when he comes to touch on the limitations of Philip's genius:—

'He was in some respects not a great man of civil affairs. To the bitter end he understood but very imperfectly the arts of peace. He could conquer, but usually he was embarrassed by his conquest. Often in the record of his life we have to note that his work must be done twice, even thrice over. Thessaly, for example, was organized into due subjection only after years of desultory fighting and intriguing; in Euboea Philip never wholly succeeded at all. There is a certain crude and tentative character about his dealings with the Greeks, and with Athens especially, which his son never would have displayed, never indeed did display. Those all powerful bonds of trade, that astute balancing of nationalities, that subtle use of religious influences, which made every province that Alexander left behind him as much his as if he had spent all his life in organizing it alone,—these things were hardly dreamed of by his father.'

To historians who ascribe to Philip anything like the above choice of ends and means the Macedonian army must needs be deeply interesting, and Mr. Hogarth describes its material and its arrangements, if briefly, yet clearly and well; but he perhaps underestimates the military importance of sea affairs in the times of Philip and his son.

'Although it might be irksome to Philip not to have the command of the Aegean, that disability was not more fatal to him than it proved two centuries later to Rome. His was a land power resting on a continental basis, and, in the main, independent of sea-going trade: and, even had Athens not had rivals on her own element, such as Rhodes, Chios, Byzantium, and Syracuse, the geographical position of Philip's realm would have placed him beyond the reach of anything but irritation from her admirals.'

Students of Captain Mahan's writings will hardly be satisfied with these sentences.

But now, taking for granted Philip's ability in the choice of means, does he deserve the bitter censure which has often been passed on him for destroying Greek liberty, and thereby doing a wrong to civilization? Not in the least, Mr. Hogarth argues. The Hellas of small states had played its part; it could only do further

good work in the world by being compelled into some kind of union and also by being forced out of its own bounds,—out of Europe into Asia and Africa. These two wholesome things Philip undertook to do for Hellas, and we must not so sympathize with the patient as to abhor the operation. Athens, in particular, had ceased to be vigorous in Philip's day, and could hold out no further promise to mankind. (Her decadence is well traced by Mr. Hogarth, though he does not make as much as we should of the effects of the great plague. Plutarch, *Per.* 36, says ἀπέβαλεν ὁ Περικλῆς τότε τῶν φίλων τοὺς πλείστους καὶ χρησιμωτάτους πρὸς τὴν πολιτείαν, and their place was filled by inferior men, both as leaders and as led. A small city state may receive from chance visitations such injuries to population, in kind and purity, if not in numbers, as can seldom befall a nation.) Hence it is a mistake, though a natural one, 'a grave error in historical perspective, to represent Philip as engaged consciously during all his reign in a great duel with Demosthenes.' That orator was not so important at Athens, and Athens was not then so important in the world. But no reader of Mr. Hogarth's is likely to fall into this error.

One other useful correction he supplies to Demosthenes' speeches. Philip's fortification of Elatea has been misrepresented and misunderstood. It was only

'The reasonable precaution of a prudent general. If it menaced any city, that city was Thebes. The site of Elatea lies more than sixty miles by any practicable road from the nearest point of the Attic frontier, and at least ninety from Athens. The whole Copaic plain, the Theban territory, and the range of Cithaeron intervene. There was absolutely no ground, except Demosthenes' unsupported word, for the belief that Philip was entrenching Elatea as a menace to Athens.'

We have implied above that Alexander is harder to understand than Philip: but this may only mean that Alexander was a man so much above the line and out of comparison with others (either in his genius or his destiny,—we need not decide now) that we cannot easily range him or find the type to which he belongs. Though we are better informed too about the son than the father, we do not know nearly enough to fix our opinions. No one can deny to Alexander military genius of the highest order; but, as to the rest, sometimes we are disposed to credit him with penetrating and far-reaching designs, conceived in the interests of civilization; sometimes we feel that a man so wanting in self-restraint and so

capable of wild acts cannot have had brain enough for all that is ascribed to him, and we suspect that, if the happy consequences of Alexander's conquests and arrangements were really conceived beforehand in the mind of anybody, it was in the mind of someone who stood behind the throne,—perhaps Ptolemy. But here Mr. Hogarth will quarrel with our premisses. He seems to deny that the king was wanting in self-restraint, and will not hear of his being really mad at any time. We should not like to say that Alexander was ever really mad; but the borderland of insanity is wide, and Mr. Hogarth is not far from our idea when he writes that the conqueror's fortune 'will raise him ever higher and higher on his pinnacle of isolation, until his nerves begin to crack and his head to swim.' Mr. E. Gardner remarks with truth (in his useful *Handbook of Greek Sculpture*, p. 435) that 'Literature has not done Alexander justice.' Why? Chiefly because there is not enough of it, and we have to puzzle the man out as best we may. What is it likely that he designed, if we look at (a) the recorded facts and (b) his character? But unhappily the character has to be made out chiefly from the facts. A portrait-bust of the king in the British Museum, as interpreted by Mr. Hogarth, vouches for Alexander's 'inordinate pride of self' and for a nature 'neither cold nor passionless': but should we read all this in the bust if it were a nameless one? 'No man not essentially emotional would risk so much for ideas.' But how do we know what ideas he had? Modern historians who are favourable to him have built up praiseworthy ideas for him, or have slipped them as a foundation under the undoubted record of his acts; but how little of the foundation is itself solid! Alexander certainly meant to make conquests, but what he meant to do with them, (if he meant anything) his early death among other things prevents us from knowing.

At all events Mr. Hogarth does not commit the mistake of giving Alexander only one plan and only one state of character. He sees that the plans *must* have changed with the openings, and that it is very likely that the character of a young man who never knew disaster and who was almost or quite worshipped in his lifetime altered for the worse. He points out the probable stages and causes of change, and traces the development of the King of Macedon and Captain General of Hellas into the Emperor of Europe and Asia. He no doubt hits the

truth in saying that Alexander designed even at starting the complete conquest of the Persian empire, and that it is needless to find special reasons for his taking this or that step forward. Such reasons may be in place in considering the growth of the Roman or the British empire; they are not wanted to explain the advance of great Oriental conquerors or of Alexander of Macedon.

On Alexander's measures as an organizer after conquest we have already quoted something. The founder of Alexandria

'Was indeed familiar with economic questions, and had a vivid interest and belief in the influence of commerce. His instructions to Nearchus before he left the Indus, his removal of the obstructions in the Tigris water-way, his proposal to create a second Phoenicia on the shore of the Persian Gulf—these are instances of a single-minded commercial purpose, which conditioned also, but less directly, many other enterprises.'

Under this head, or at least under the head of peaceful reorganization, might have been mentioned Alexander's new arrangement of the relations of the town and temple of Ephesus, designed in the interest of good police. One or two of Mr. Hogarth's estimates of men have quite the Mommsen ring about them, as for instance when he speaks of 'respectable corporals like Phocion.' His style is fresh and vigorous, but we note a frequent employment of modern geographical names. Things happen with him near Volo, in Roumelia, or in the Vardar plain. The map of the area of Alexander's Asiatic conquests is filled up with few but modern names. We have thought twice before speaking of this, in deference to Mr. Hogarth's double position as traveller and historian, but we find ourselves after all unable to see what end is served by the practice. If the representatives of the Macedonian colonies 'survive still as ganglia in Asia's nerve-system of caravan roads,' both the ancient and the modern name might be given, but to give the modern name alone is scarcely lucid enough. To speak also of a *race* as Aryan is not to use the best method of expression.

Mr. Hogarth is too modest in calling his book 'Two Essays in Biography.' It is more than that. He has compressed into a volume of moderate size really all that there is to know about two great kings. It is a good thing to have a modern book, and a thorough book, which is not bulky or cumbersome. The author has succeeded in keeping the size of his work down by not being afraid to speak straight out and by boldly

passing over many bewildering intrigues in which no one can see clear, while he relegates what he has to say of the uncertain chronology to a final note where it can all be taken together. On the whole we feel on looking back on the book that a page of history gains in life and interest by being treated in the form of biography. As history must be read, if it is to be written, this perhaps outweighs one drawback which generally attends biography, namely the omission of some subjects akin to the life told, but not near enough to the man himself for insertion. We should have liked to hear Mr. Hogarth's estimate of the remoter consequences of the Macedonian conquests,—a subject on which Finlay touched, but not exhaustively,—and to see the reaction of the East upon Greece analysed. The points in organization and

usage which the Macedonian rulers, like the Romans after them, took over from the subject East are a curious study. Why, for instance, was the eagle so honoured by Alexander? It was revered in the East before him, but only as one among other sacred animals. Neglecting others, he attached the idea of the eagle closely to himself, and it was finally taken up into the Alexander legend, playing a part which not even the ram or the serpent equals.

The illustrations to Mr. Hogarth's book (chiefly from medallions and portrait-busts) deserve a word of praise. The frontispiece, Alexander in Battle, from the Sarcophagus of the Satraps, now at Constantinople, is not only very beautiful but also new to most English readers.

FRANKLIN T. RICHARDS.

BLASS'S EDITION OF THE ACTS.

Acta Apostolorum. Editio philologica apparatus critico, commentario perpetuo, indice verborum illustrata auctore FRIDERICO BLASS. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht. 1895. Pp. 334. 12 mk.
Acta Apostolorum secundum formam quae videtur Romanam, edidit FRIDERICUS BLASS. Lipsic: B. S. Teubner. 1896. Pp. 96.

A COMMENTARY on the Acts from so distinguished a scholar as Dr. Blass is sure to deserve and receive much attention, and it may be said at once that the notes, in which no attempt is made to discuss dogmatic questions, are for the most part models of terse, clear and scholarly exegesis. For example on 11, 26 it would be difficult to have a better note than this:—

‘Χρηστιανοί ex N utique recipiendum. Nempe a Graecis id nomen inditum, cum Ναζωραίους vocarent Iudaei, 24, 5; Graeci autem nomen Χριστός, quod ignotum sibi et sine intellectu esset, in Χρηστός nomen haud inusitatum (exstat terdecies in C. I. Att. vol. iii.) facillima ratione mutaverunt, qui est mos vulgi omnibus aetatibus. Inde Χρηστιανοί ut Ἡρωδιανοί (Mt. 22, 16), Καρποκρατιανοί, Σιμωνιανοί al., Ἀττικιανὰ (ἀντίγραφα) ab Ἀττικὸς, formatione et Romanis et Graecis illo aevo usitata. Cf. Tertull. Apol. 3: *sed et tum cum perperam Chrestianus pronuntiatur a vobis (nam nec nominis certa est notitia*

apud vos), de suavitatem vel benignitate compositum est. Lactant. i. div. i. 4: *exponenda huius nominis (Christus) ratio est propter ignorantiam eorum, qui cum immutata litera Chrestum solent dicere.*’ Or again 20, 28 in the vexed passage ποιμαίνειν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ θεοῦ, ἣν περιποιήσατο διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ ἰδίου, where Dr. Blass rightly reads with most MSS. τοῦ κυρίου, he wisely dismisses the whole controversy in a brief phrase of sound sense—‘solita confusio inter κύριος et θεός (etiam v. 32), alias innocua, hic magnas turbas dedit, quia διὰ τ. αἰμ. τ. ἰδ. ad θεοῦ referendum,’ and he points out (Prol. p. 36) that the change would readily be made in an age when ‘moris factum erat ut θεός Iesus diceretur,’ while he might have added that the phrase ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ occurs eleven times in St. Paul’s epistles so that it would be readily substituted for ἐκκ. τοῦ κυρίου which is unique in N.T. If indeed any fault is to be found with the exegesis it is that it deals too much with single words or phrases and neglects the sometimes obscure connection of thought. For instance in the very difficult speech of Peter 10, 34–39 the sequence of thought is by no means made clear, though the brilliant suggestion to omit κύριος in the phrase οὗτός ἐστι πάντων κύριος (a hopeless riddle in our English Bible), and so render ‘the message which he sent . . . through Jesus Christ, that (message) is for all men’ deserves the most care-

ful consideration. The equally difficult speech of Peter 1, 16-22 is also left without any clear explanation, and in 8, 33 one would like something better on ἐν τῇ ταπεινώσει αὐτοῦ ἢ κρίσις αὐτοῦ ἡρῶη than 'sensu fere cassa; aliter Hebr. Non facile perspicitur qua ratione ducas intellexerit.' The ἀρά γε γινώσκεις ἢ ἀναγινώσκεις; of Philip is certainly not answered by such a note.

It is not, however, in the exegetical notes that the special interest of this edition lies. It is well known that the codex Bezae presents, especially in the Acts, a very great number of variants from the readings of most MSS., and these variants are supported by the Syriac version ('versio N.T. syriaca, dicta Philoxeniana a Philoxeno episcopo Hierapolitano, qui per Polycarpum choriepiscopum eam faciendam curavit, finita a. 508; eadem uno fere saeculo post per Thomam Charklensem, Mabugi episcopum, Alexandriae degentem, denuo cum codicibus graecis comparata atque ex eis aucta est, eaque Thomae additamenta cognationem versionis cum D effecerunt; p. 25), and also, among others, by 'codex latinus palimpsestus, regius dictus apud Tischendorfium, quia in bibliotheca Parisiensi olim regia asservatur, iam autem Floriacensis dicendus, postquam patefactum est monasterii Floriacensis (*Fleury*) olim eum fuisse' (p. 27) which is also in striking harmony with Cyprian's quotations from the Acts ('ita concinere F cum Cypriano Carthaginiensi episcopo, ubi is locos ex Actis affert, ut videamus habuisse Cyprianum eandem fere hanc Actorum versionem,' p. 27). This text, which seems to have held its ground chiefly in the west, Dr. Blass marks β , while the ordinary text, which prevailed in the east, he marks α . In his apparatus criticus he very lucidly prints the readings of the α sources separately above the readings of the β sources, and he has also printed what he considers the correct β text independently in a separate volume. The theory which he holds is one 'quam dudum invenit Ioannes Clericus: his Lucam sua edidisse,' and, after referring to the description given in Catullus xxii. of Sufferus, who was not content to keep his poems 'sic ut fiat in palimpseston relata,' he thus proceeds in words which it would be unfair to abridge:

'Itaque ei qui versus pangebant eos in charta vili primum scribere solebant, ut etiam delere aut mutare possent quae sibi postea minus placerent; itidem Lucam fecisse crediderim, Theophilo autem librum non in palimpsesto scriptum misisse, sed in charta,

etsi non regia, tamen paullo meliore. Possum commemorare etiam Aristotelis librum περὶ πολιτείας 'Αθηναίων nuper repertum; est exemplar ad usum privatum scriptum in aversa charta, cum adversa iam pridem esset aliis scripturis oppleta; fuerit huius simile prius exemplar Lucae, sed ad Theophilum tale non erat mittendum. Iam fac prius illud, quod manserat apud auctorem, ab aliis esse descriptum: habebis originem duarum recensionum minime certam, sed haud improbabilem' (p. 32).

Against the ordinary theory that β is a recension of α made by another and later hand, Dr. Blass says: 'Nego potuisse quemquam, qui a rebus illis alienus esset, addere quae non paucis locis in β ex intima rerum cognitione addita sunt: velut Mnaesonem, apud quem deverterunt Paulus comitesque (21, 16), in vico habitasse inter Caesaream et Hierosolyma cito, vel promississe Dominum usque ad Pentecosten se spiritum sanctum eis missurum esse, non ipso eodie (1, 5 cf. 2, 1) vel...' and he then proceeds: 'Sed fac potuerit aliquis quod profecto non potuit: nego voluisse Acta ita refingere ut esse in β videmus. Non perspicua magis narratio reddenda erat, nisi paucis locis, brevior fortasse reddi poterat, sed ille reddidit etiam prolixior, non elegantiam sectatus est, non mutavit sententias; cur igitur omnino quicquam mutavit?' so that as no one *could* or *would* have executed such a recension we are reduced to referring it to Luke himself, 'ei nempe neque facultas deesse poterat neque voluntas,' since any one who writes out a composition twice is sure to emend and above all omit what seems superfluous, this latter point proving that β cannot come from α because it is fuller and longer.

Now it is obvious at once that this theory of his work having been first written by Luke on the back of some other MS. and then copied and emended by him for despatch to his distinguished friend Theophilus, while the original autograph was treasured and preserved in the Roman church, is a theory which is very gratifying to the imagination but which needs very strong evidence before it can be accepted as having reasonable claim to represent actual fact. Examined in that light the evidence is (I) inadequate and (II) points to an opposite conclusion.

I. Taking first the evidence which according to Dr. Blass compels us to refer the β text to Luke himself, it is impossible, of course, to deal with all the passages he refers to, though they are not very numerous, but the two passages quoted above, which he

himself puts in the fore-front of his argument, may fairly be taken as test passages and deserve to be examined.

In 21, 16 we have

(α) συνῆλθον δὲ καὶ τῶν μαθητῶν ἀπὸ Καισαρείας σὺν ἡμῖν, ἄγοντες παρ' ᾧ ξενισθῶμεν Μνάσωνι τινι Κυπρίῳ, ἀρχαίῳ μαθητῇ· γενομένων δὲ ἡμῶν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα...

(β)...σὺν ἡμῖν, οὗτοι δὲ ἤγαγον ἡμᾶς πρὸς οὓς ξενισθῶμεν, καὶ παραγένομενοι εἰς τινα κώμην ἐγενόμεθα παρὰ Μν. Κ. μαθ. ἀρχ. καθεῖθεν ἐξίοντες ἤλθομεν εἰς Ι.

Here the note is—'Multo autem disertius in β, unde id quoque elucet, in vico aliquo inter Caes. et Hier. Mnasonem habitavisse. Neque enim unius diei erat iter cum esset milium p. lxviii....et ex more scriptoris indicandum erat, ubi pernoctavissent.' The phrase 'multo disertius in β' shall be noticed presently, but we ask at once what is the proof that a corrector could not or would not have made the alterations. There is absolutely none, and the passage is one which almost suggests correction. Firstly the words ἄγοντες παρ' ᾧ ξενισθῶμεν Μνάσωνι, are as Dr. Blass himself notes ('concise et sub-obscurum pro πρὸς Μν. ἵνα ξενισθ. παρ' αὐτῷ') not clear and invite elucidation; secondly the phrase 'conducting us to the house of Mnason,' supposing that Mnason lived in Jerusalem, seems to anticipate Paul's arrival there and to make the phrase 'but when we came to Jerusalem' appear awkward, although it is as natural as the famous 'and so we came to Rome' of 28, 14, where Dr. Blass boldly writes 'ἤλθαμεν, melius erat ἐπορεύομεθα quia finis itineris v. 16 demum commemoratur'; and, thirdly, the remark that they stayed the night at 'a certain village' is exactly one which would be made by a corrector, because the fact of the journey from Caesarea to Jerusalem involving a halt for the night is expressly mentioned on St. Paul's return journey in this very book (23, 31). To argue that the variants of the β text need 'intima rerum cognitio' and could only have been penned by Luke himself is merely to maintain a paradox. Any body could make them, and after all they only tell us that Paul spent the night at 'a certain village' and that for these few hours of sleep he was specially conducted to the house of 'one Mnason a Cypriot and an ancient disciple.' That he received kindly hospitality at Jerusalem seems a fact worth recording, but at whose house he slept in an unknown village for a single night is a matter of infinite unimportance.

Taking the second case which Dr. Blass quotes, we find that in 1, 5 the promise of 'the Spirit' is οὐ μετὰ πολλὰς ταύτας ἡμέρας, while β adds ἕως τῆς πενηκότης, and 2, 1 α gives καὶ ἐν τῷ συμπληροῦσθαι τὴν ἡμέραν τῆς πενι, while β has καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις τοῦ συμπλ. τὴν ἡμ. τῆς πενι. Dr. Blass explains the reading of α in 2, 1 as placing the outpouring of the Spirit on some day preceding Pentecost ('ἐν τῷ συμπλ. = cum in eo esset ut compleretur, i.e. brevi ante diem pent.'), a meaning which β clearly indicates; and he is possibly right, for ἐν τῷ συμπλ. τὰς ἡμ. both here and in Luke 9, 51 is a very ambiguous phrase. But what possible reason can there be for asserting that the β version can only come from the pen of Luke? As with the preceding passage we may form conjectural guesses as to its origin, but we can do nothing more, and the editor who quotes these two passages among the leading proofs of his theory can at best only expect a verdict of 'not proven.'

II. The variants in β (i.) in many places exhibit the clear characteristics of later additions, and (ii.) in many others are of such a nature that, if they had stood in the original draft, no reason can be assigned for Luke (or indeed for any one) altering them.

Appended are some of these variants arranged roughly in groups, the reading of α being in each case given first.

(A).

5, 32 τῶν ῥημάτων τούτων; β. adds πάντων.
6, 10 ἀντιστῆναι τῷ πνεύματι ᾧ ἐλάλει; β. adds διὰ τὸ ἐλέγχεσθαι ὑπ' αὐτοῦ μετὰ πάσης παρησίας.

9, 5 ὁ δὲ (εἶπεν); β. gives ὁ δὲ τρέμων τε καὶ θαμβῶν ἐπὶ τῷ γεγονότι αὐτῷ εἶπεν.

9, 20 ἐκήρυσεν; β. adds μετὰ πάσης παρησίας.

10, 33 παραγενόμενος; β. ἐν τάχει παραγενόμενος.

10, 41 συνεπίομεν αὐτῷ μετὰ τὸ ἀναστῆναι; β. συνεπίομεν αὐτῷ καὶ συνεστράφημεν μετ' αὐτοῦ ἡμέρας τεσσαράκοντα μ. τ. α.

12, 13 σκοληκόβρωτος ἐξέβηξεν; β. adds ἐτι ζῶν before ἐξ.

14, 9 ἤκουεν τοῦ ΙΙ.; β. ἠδέως ἤκουεν.

14, 10 καὶ ἤλατο; β. καὶ εὐθὺς παραχρῆμα ἤλατο.

19, 7 ἐπαρρησίαζετο; β. adds ἐν δυνάμει μεγάλῃ.

20, 1 παρακάλεσας; β. πολλὰ παρακάλεσας.

(B).

6, 8 ἐποίει...σημεῖα μέγαλα ἐν τῷ λαῷ; β. adds διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος κυρίου ('Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ).

9, 7 ἐπιθεῖς ἐπ' αὐτὸν τὴν χεῖρα; β. ἐπέθηκεν αὐτῷ τὴν χεῖρα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ.

9, 40 Ταβιθά ἀνάστηθι ἢ δὲ ἤνοιξεν...; β. Ταβιθά ἀνάστηθι ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ ἢ δὲ παραχρῆμα ἤνοιξεν.

14, 10 ἀνάστηθι; β. σοὶ λέγω, ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ ἀνάστηθι.

16, 4 παρεδίδουσιν αὐτοῖς φυλάσσειν τὰ δόγματα; β. ἡσ ἐκήρυσσον αὐτοῖς μετὰ πάσης παρρησίας τὸν κύριον Ἰησοῦν χριστόν, ἅμα παραδίδοντες...

18, 4 διελέγετο; β. adds ἐντιθεῖς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ.

18, 8 ἐπίστανον καὶ ἐβαπτίζοντο; β. ἡσ ἐβαπτίζοντο, πιστεύοντες τῷ θεῷ διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ.

8, 37 is inserted from β. εἶπε δὲ αὐτῷ ὁ Φίλιππος· εἰ πιστεύεις ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας σοὶ ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ εἶπε· πιστεύω τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ εἶναι τὸν Ἰησοῦν. (Dr. Blass says 'facile intelligitur et a plena narratione haec abesse non potuisse et potuisse a contractione.' The 'facile' is beyond me.)

(C).

7, 55 Ἰησοῦν; β. Ἰησοῦν τὸν κύριον.

13, 32 Ἰησοῦν; β. τὸν κύριον Ἰησοῦν χριστόν.

20, 21 εἰς τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν; β. διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ.

(D).

15, 7 Πέτρος εἶπεν; β. Πέτρος ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ εἶπεν.

15, 29 εὐ πράξετε; β. εὐ πράξετε, φερόμενοι ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι.

15, 32 προφῆται ὄντες; β. προφῆται ὄντες πληρεῖς πνεύματος ἁγίου.

19, 4 ἐγένετο... Παῦλον διελθόντα; β. θέλοντος δὲ τοῦ Παύλου κατὰ τὴν ἰδίαν βουλὴν πορεύεσθαι εἰς Ἱερ. εἶπεν αὐτῷ τὸ πνεῦμα.

20, 3 ἐγένετο γνώμης ὑποστρέφειν; β. εἶπεν δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτῷ ὑποστρέφειν.

The characteristic of the variants in group A is to exaggerate the emphasis, in B to bring in religious formula, in C to substitute for the simpler and natural names of Jesus a later and more theological title, and in D to emphasize words and actions as inspired, while another large group might have been added of variants which are purely explanatory (e.g. 5, 35 αὐτοῖς but β. τοῖς

ἄρχοντας καὶ τοὺς συνέδρους). The whole of them bear traces of being subsequent corrections of the text by a second-rate hand; that they were Luke's original version is incredible. If Peter said to Tabitha and Paul to the cripple 'Rise up in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ,' why should Luke in both cases first so state and then afterwards in both cases strike out all the words except ἀνάστηθι?

(ii.) It is needless to labour the second point, viz. that in many cases, if β were original, no reason for altering it can be assigned, because the notes which Dr. Blass continually makes upon the β text are fatal to his own argument. The explanations given in that text are often good and the editor in his reverence for it perpetually inserts such notes as these, 'in β structura clarior'; 'verior hic fortasse lectio β'; 'disertius β quam α'; 'male sunt haec in α conexa, et secundum β...'; 'disertius D¹'; 'magis arridet lectio D'; 'β transitum parat ad sequentia, quae in α valde abrupte adjecta sunt.' But, surely, if these notes are justified, why did Luke, who was a writer of at least considerable skill, first write what was clear and good, and then deliberately substitute for it what was inferior and confusing?

On the whole the value of the β variants seems very small. The question of their origin may occupy the attention of scholars with ample leisure and does not seem to admit of any solution, but they add practically nothing to our real knowledge of the Acts, while they frequently mar and spoil what they seek to improve. The final verses of our present text are a model of powerful composition, while the rhythmic beauty of their closing cadence—*μέτα πάσης παρρησίας ἀκολούτως*—might strike even an unpractised ear, but, when there is a desire to drag in theological formulae, nothing is sacred, and the β text tacks on to it the words *λέγων ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, δι' οὗ μέλλει πᾶς ὁ κόσμος κρίνεσθαι*. 'Non inepte,' says Dr. Blass, 'hoc in fine libri ponitur.' Most people will not agree with him, and, even on his own theory, the opinion of Luke must have been different for, after writing the words he deliberately struck them out.

T. E. PAGE.

¹ i.e. codex Bezae.

ARCHAEOLOGY.

DE RIDDER ON EARLY GREEK
BRONZE RELIEFS.

De ectypis quibusdam aeneis quae falso vocantur 'Argivo-Corinthiaca.' A. DE RIDDER. Paris, 1896.

THIS little brochure is a piece of special pleading against the generally-received views of Furtwaengler and other authorities on early Greek bronze reliefs. Hitherto it has generally been accepted on Furtwaengler's authority that they are of Corinthian, or rather Argivo-Corinthian, origin; the object of this book is to shew that they are almost entirely Ionian, to a great extent Chalcidian, in their affinities. We are not sure that the author has proved his case; many of his arguments are by no means convincing, and rest far too much on subtle and minor differences, as for instance the presence or absence of certain ornamental patterns on Corinthian vases, or from the use of certain animals and exclusion of others.

The author betrays a certain vagueness on the matter of 'Chalcidian' vases. After stating (correctly enough) on p. 40 that no certain Chalcidian vases exist except such as bear inscriptions in the alphabet of Chalkis, he argues on p. 68 that the chariot *en face* is only found on Chalcidian, never on Corinthian vases. But there are several vases existing which do not bear Chalcidian inscriptions, and yet are decorated with chariots *en face* (e.g. Louvre Cat. E 648; Brit. Mus. B 15). Now the Louvre vase here quoted is undoubtedly Corinthian; the Brit. Mus. vase also appears to be, although Loeschke (*Athen. Mittheil.* 1894, p. 516, note 1) attributes it rather arbitrarily to Chalkis.

The term 'Peloponnesian art' is a veritable red rag to M. de Ridder. He even maintains that the chest of Kypselos must have been Ionian, not Corinthian; yet the evidence of the inscriptions given by Pausanias points to a Doric dialect and Corinthian alphabet; the subjects find their closest parallel in the Corinthian vases; while the whole history of the chest is in close connection with Corinth. Further he is reduced to the necessity of maintaining that the one inscription occurring on these reliefs, which is in the Argive alphabet, that of the *ἄλιος γέρον*, may be a later addition, and does not necessarily connote Argive manufacture.

A few other small points may be noted, which also call for comment. The bronze

relief from Eleutheræ referred to on p. 59, now in the British Museum, must be Corinthian; the peculiar head-dress is also found on Corinthian vases (e.g. *Brit. Mus. Vase Cat.* ii. B 18), and is certainly not Ionic. No mention is made of the lower row of figures on the Polledrara bust (*Journ. Hell. Stud.* 1894, pl. 8); they are quite Ionian in character, and as specimens of Ionian bronze reliefs would have furnished M. de Ridder with a useful argument.

On p. 43, note 13, is a reference to *Journ. Hell. Stud.* 1891, pl. 5, which proves to be a plan of Salamis (Cyprus), although we are prepared to expect a Proto-Corinthian vase, not the Macmillan lekythos, as that is referred to immediately below; no other Proto-Corinthian vase has been published in the *Journ. Hell. Stud.* except the Geryon pyxis (vol. v. (1884), p. 176).

P. 45, 'aenea ectypa Perugiae reperta' should be 'argentea'; also the reference should be to the *Römische Mittheil.* for 1894, not 1895. On pp. 36, 40 occurs the curious plural form 'aryballa'; this does not appear to find authority in Greek literature; but the word does not occur at all in classical Latin.

M. de Ridder has perhaps been carried away too much by enthusiasm for his own line of argument; but at the same time he must be recognised as one of the greatest authorities on early Greek bronze work, as his catalogues of the Athens collections testify; the knowledge and research he displays demand our heartiest commendation, and will, we trust, inspire others to turn their attention to this very important subject which has hitherto been somewhat neglected. We can confidently recommend a perusal of this work to all students of Greek art.

H. B. WALTERS.

Journal of Hellenic Studies, vol. xvi. part 2. 1896.

10. Karian Sites and Inscriptions. Part ii. W. R. Paton and J. L. Myres. With two plates, and cuts. Notes on the Latmos district and early tombs; question of early civilisation of Caria discussed.

11. A Scarab from Cyprus. G. D. Pierides. With cut.

Describes a gem with Herakles slaying the lion, of Graeco-Phoenician work.

12. I. A Stone Tripod at Oxford. P. Gardner. With plate and two cuts.

The tripod is a Greek original of the fifth century, resembling one found at Olympia.

II. The Mantinea Basis. P. Gardner. With two cuts.

An arrangement of the three slabs on the front of the base, so as to dispense with the necessity of imagining a fourth now lost.

13. A Kylix with a new *καλός* name. Cecil Smith. With plate.

The cup belongs to the Epiktetan cycle; the new name is Akestor.

14. The Game of Polis and Plato's *Rep.* 422 E. W. Ridgeway. With five cuts.

A discussion of the game, illustrated by existing specimens of ancient draughtsmen and boards.

15. Excavations at Abae and Hyampolis in Phocis. V. W. Yorke. With plate and five cuts.

A description of the sites and inscriptions found there.

16. Epigraphical Notes from Eastern Macedonia and Thrace. J. A. R. Munro.

Publishes inscriptions collected in 1896.

17. A Greek Goldsmith's Mould in the Ashmolean Museum. H. S. Jones. With five cuts.

Discusses early graven metal-work and the subjects treated; traces the origin of this industry to Chalcis and Corinth.

18. Archaeology in Greece, 1895-6. Cecil Smith. I. General. II. Melos. H. B. W.

Jahrbuch des K. deutschen Arch. Inst. Bd. xii. Part. i. 1897.

1. H. Dragendorff. Zwei altattische Malereien auf Marmor. Two plates. Publishes (1) disc with portrait of the physician Aineios in Athens Museum; A. was a Coan Asklepiad and lived about B.C. 520; (2) two fragments of shield with snakes from border of aegis in relief on exterior and upper part of Nike painted on interior; style of painting to be compared with best r.f. vases; about B.C. 500.

2. E. Pernice. Die Korinthischen Pinakes im Antiquarium der Königl. Museum. 37 cuts.

Corrects and completes descriptions in Furtwängler's catalogue, necessitated by subsequent careful cleaning and examination; several joins made, and some new fragments described.

3. A. Michaelis. Eine alexandrinische Erzfigur des Goetheschen Sammlung. Two cuts.

Publishes statuette of small man in cap, looking back and making a gesture with right hand; style points to Ptolemaic Egypt, and features of Bedouin type.

4. E. Petersen. Vasenscherbe von Tell-Defenneh.

Refers subject of one fragment (man attacking woman with sword) to story of Odysseus and Kirke.

Anzeiger: Archaeologische Mittheilungen aus Süd-Russland. Die westdeutschen Altertums-sammlungen (Metz, Mainz, Trier, etc.; recent acquisitions). Meetings of Arch. Gesellschaft (address by Schöne on E. Curtius; Trendelenburg on paintings in temple of Zeus at Olympia, etc.). Bibliography and summary of archaeological journals. H. B. W.

Revue Numismatique. Part i. 1897.

The *Revue*, established in 1837, enters this year on a new series (the fourth). The *Annuaire de la société française de Numismatique*, which from time to time contained articles on classical numismatics, has been discontinued, but its contributors will now give their support to the *Revue Numismatique*. The present number contains the first instalment of an article by M. R. Mowat on 'Combinaisons secrètes de lettres dans les marques monétaires de l'Empire Romain.'

Numismatische Zeitschrift. Vol. xxviii. for 1896. (Vienna, 1897).

M. Bahrdfeldt. 'Nachträge und Berichtigungen zur Münzkunde der römischen Republik.' This article, the concluding part of which will appear in vol. xxix. occupies pp. 1 to 170 and is illustrated by cuts and twelve plates. It consists principally of additions to Babelon's *Monnaies de la république romaine*. O. Seeck. 'Sesterz und Follis.'

Revue suisse de Numismatique. Vol. vi.

Imhoof-Blumer. 'Zur Münzkunde Kleinasiens' (part 3). Deals with the coinage of numerous Lydian cities. The following points may be noted. *Bagis*. Valerian on horse, and three Phrygian soldiers: a type commemorating the 'Victoria Parthica' of 259. *Daldis Flaviopolis*. Coins with the name of *Flaviopolis* (in honour of Vespasian and Titus) and *Caesarea*. A new type with a curious terminal figure of Herakles (Pl. iii. 18). *Germe*. It is satisfactorily shown that the coins bearing the name of Germe belong to the Lydian Germe on the Caicus and not to Germe on the Rhyndacus. *Herakleia on the Sipylos*. All the coins hitherto attributed to this town seem to be mis-described, and belong elsewhere. *Hermokapelia*. On the site etc. The coin supposed to read Thyessos is probably of Thessalonica. *Hypaipa*. The veiled cultus-statue on the coins is probably that of Artemis Anaitis: a lighted altar of unusual (conical) form, placed in a temple, is perhaps connected with the fire-worship practised by Persians in Hypaipa in the time of Pausanias (Paus. v. 27, 3). *Mossyna*. All the coins hitherto attributed to this place belong elsewhere. *Paktolos*. No town of this name is known and the supposed coins of Paktolos are mis-read pieces of other places. *Philadelphia*. Under Caligula and Claudius struck coins with the name of 'Neocaesarea.' One coin (Pl. v. 11) bears the portrait of Tiberius Gemellus, son of the younger Drusus. *Sala*. Called on its coins 'Domitianopolis' in the time of Domitian. *Sardis*. A bronze coin (Pl. v. 23) with the portrait of Albinus, an Emperor whose portrait was hitherto only known—at least as far as the coins of Greek cities are concerned—at Pautalia, Smyrna and Side.

WARWICK WROTH.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

American Journal of Philology. Vol. xvii, 4. Whole No. 68. Dec. 1896.

Contributions to the Interpretation of the Veda, M. Bloomfield. On the text of the *Truculentus* of *Plautus*, W. M. Lindsay. Considers that a sudden

change of script in the archetype may have been the real cause of the change for the worse in our Plautine text at the beginning of the *Truculentus*. *Brugmann's Law* and the *Sanskrit Vṛddhi*, C. D. Buck. Maintains that certain form categories in Sanskrit

which are most simply explained through Brugmann's Law—the equation of European *o* with Skt. *ā* in open syllables—are intelligible without our having recourse to this law. *Latin Glosses*, O. B. Schlutter, explains many of the glosses in the *Corpus Glossarum*.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES. Delitzsch's *Assyrisches Handwörterbuch* 'a great work.' Thumb's *Handbuch der neugriechischen Volkssprache* 'deserves to be studied by all classical students sojourning in Greece.' Fitch's *De Argonautarum Reditu Quaestiones Selectae* 'in so uncertain and difficult a subject his results may be accepted as tenable, at least until new combinations are brought to impugn them.'

Rheinisches Museum für Philologie. Vol. 52, 2. 1897.

Studien zu Ciceros Briefen an Atticus (IX, X), O. E. Schmidt. Maintains against C. A. Lehmann his already published view, that the *Mediceus* is the foundation for the text, and examines special passages in support. *Zu attischen Dionysos-Festen*, A. Körte. (1) Confutes Gilbert's theory, which has been adopted by Dörpfeld, that the *Lenaea* were nothing but the last day of the *Anthesteria*. (2) Attempts to explain the difficulty that the great Dionysian list of victors knows of no Agon of comic actors at the great Dionysia. (3) The harp-player *Nikokles* probably won his victory not earlier than 280 B.C. *Anecdota Fulgentianum*, R. Helm. Maintains the probability of the authorship of *Fulgentius the Mythographer*

for the *super Thebaide*. *Buphonia*, H. von Prott. Investigates the origin of this Attic feast. *Zu lateinischen Dichtern*, M. Ihm. (1) The comic *Epyllion vespae iudicium coci et pistoris iudice Vulcano*. (2) The *Carmen contra Flavianum* (Cod. Paris, 8084). (3) A lost poem of *Damasus*? *Beiträge zur Quellenkunde des Orients im Alterthum*, L. Jeep. Chiefly with reference to the epitome of Church-History by *Philostorgius*. *Zu den Assyriaka des Ktesias*, P. Krumbholz. Continued from vol. 50 [Cl. Rev. ix. 285]. As we know that the information of *Diodorus* about Assyria comes from *Ktesias*, so we find that *Justin* stands in nearer or further relation to him. *Varia*, W. Kroll.

MISCELLAN. *Zwei Vermuthungen zur griechischen Kunstgeschichte*, J. Ziehen. (1) On a bronze statuette at Vienna. (2) On a work of *Euphranon* mentioned by *Pliny*. *Der Brand von Lugudunum*, O. Hirschfeld. This, mentioned in 91st letter of *Seneca*, took place probably at the beginning of 65 A.D. *Ecpleur lacuna in Libanii declamatione quae inscribitur μάγν κατνυοία*, R. Förster. *Zur Ueberlieferung der Physiognomik des Adamantios*, R. Förster. Ein neu entdecktes *Priscianbruchstück*, C. Heldmann. Here first published. *Carmen epigraphium*, F. B. Recently found at the church of S. Ursula in Cologne. *Carpus*, E. Lommatsch. This is the name of *Trimalchio's carver* (*Petron.* c. 36), and it is here explained. The *Latin carpere* has no connexion with *καρπός* 'fruit,' but probably with *καρπός* 'wrist.'

LIST OF NEW BOOKS.

FOREIGN BOOKS.

- Aeschylus*. Preuss (A.) *De versuum iambicorum in melicis partibus usu Aeschyleo*. 8vo. 118 pp. Leipzig.
- Anthologia*. Wachtler (A.) *Studien zum Buche der palatinischen Anthologie*. 8vo. 22 pp. Villach.
- Aristophanes*. Traduction nouvelle par E. Talbot. Préface de Sully-Prudhomme. 2 vols. 8vo. viii, 412; 515 pp. Paris, Lemerre. 15 fr.
- Heidlues (B.) *Ueber die Wolken des Aristophanes*. 4to. 59 pp. Köln.
- Passow (W.) *De Aristophane defendendo contra invasionem Eucipideam. I: de terminis parodiae*. 4to. 23 pp. Hirschberg.
- Aristoteles*. *Commentaria in Aristotelem graeca*. Vol. XV. Joannis Philoponi in Aristotelis de anima libros commentaria, ed. M. Hayduck. 8vo. xix, 670 pp. Berlin, Reimer. 27 Mk.
- Baltin* (F.) *Italienische Herbsttage. Erinnerungen an den fünften archäologischen Kursus (1895) deutscher Gymnasiallehrer in Italien*. 4to. 34 pp. Dessau.
- Beauchet* (L.) *Histoire du droit privé de la République athénienne*. 4 vols. 8vo. iii, 545; 556; 752; 579 pp. Paris, Chevalier-Maresq. 36 fr.
- Biltz* (O.) *Der Phädo Plato's und Mendelssohns*. 8vo. 63 pp. Berlin, Mayer & M. 1 Mk. 50.
- Callegari* (E.) *Imprese militari e morte di Alessandro Severo*. 8vo. 72 pp. Padua.
- Curtius*, Korb (F.) *Der Gebrauch des Infinitivs bei Q. Curtius Rufus*. I. 8vo. 19 pp. Prag.
- Demosthenes*. Bethe (E.) *Demosthenis scriptorum corpus ubi et qua aetate collectum editumque sit*. 4to. 16 pp. Rostock.

- Wagner (H.) *Appellatio adversus Enbulidem num Demostheni abiudicanda sit*. 8vo. 44 pp. Würzburg.
- Dio Chrysostomus*. Hahn (C.) *De Dionis Chrysostomi orationibus, quae inscribuntur Diogenes (VI, VIII, IX, X)*. 8vo. 73 pp. Göttingen.
- Eickhoff* (H.) *Zwei Schriften des Basilus und des Augustinus als geschichtliche Dokumente der Vereinigung von klassischer Bildung und Christentum*. 4to. 21 pp. Schleswig.
- Festus Avienus*. Fischer (P. G.) *Der gestirnte Himmel. Versuch einer Uebersetzung der Aratea des Rufus Festus Avienus*. (V. 930—Schluss.) 8vo. 23 pp. Komotau.
- Fitch* (E.) *De Argonautarum reditu quaestiones selectae*. 8vo. 77 pp. Göttingen.
- Freytag* (J.) *De Anonymi *περί ὕψους* sublimi genere dicendi*. 8vo. 82 pp. Hildesheim.
- Froelich* (G.) *Quatenus in nominibus hominum Doricorum propriis historici Graeci formis dialecticis usi vel Atticam dialectum secuti sint*. II. 4to. 16 pp. Insterburg.
- Haube* (O.) *Die Epen der römischen Litteratur im Zeitalter der Republik*. II. 4to. 11 pp. Schrimm.
- Herkenrath* (R.) *Studien zu den griechischen Grabschriften*. 8vo. 56 pp. Feldkirch.
- Hirzel*. *Die Homonymie der griechischen Götter nach der Lehre antiker Theologen*. 8vo. 61 pp. Leipzig.
- Homeri Odysseae carmina cum apparatu critico ediderunt J. van Leeuwen, J. F. et M. B. Mendes da Costa*. Pars I. *Carmen I.—XII*. 8vo. xxvii, 292 pp. Leiden, Sijthoff. 3 Mk.

- Dühr. Homer's Odyssee in niederdeutscher poetischer Übertragung. Proben aus den ersten Büchern. 4to. 18 pp. Nordhausen.
- Irmischer (E.) Homers Odyssee, Buch XXII, Nachdichtung. 4to. 10 pp. Dresden.
- Horatius. Handel (S.) De troporum apud Horatium usu. Pars prior: Carmina. 8vo. 42 pp. Brody.
- Inscriptions grecques et latines de la Syrie publiées par Waddington. Index alphabétique et analytique, rédigé par J. B. Chabot. 4to. 27 pp. (From 'Revue Archéologique,' 1896.) Paris.
- Jahn (P.) Die Art der Abhängigkeit Vergils von Theokrit. 4to. 29 pp. Berlin.
- Köhler (Ulr.) Ueber Probleme der griechischen Vorzeit. 8vo. 17 pp. Berlin, Reimer. 1 Mk. 50. (Aus 'Sitzungsberichte der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin.')
- Lamer (Jo.) De choriambicis Graecorum poetarum versibus. 8vo. 142 pp. Leipzig, Gräfe. 2 Mk.
- Literaturdenkmäler (lateinische) des xv. und xvi. Jahrhunderts, herausgegeben von M. Hermann. 13: Macropedius (van Langveldt) (Georgius): Rebelles und Aluta, herausgegeben von Johs. Bolte. 12 mo. xlii, 104 pp., engravings and musical notation. Berlin, Weidmann. 3 Mk.
- Mair (G.) 'Ελληνικά. 8vo. 16 pp. Villach.
- Meister. Ein althessalisches Ehrendekret für den Korinthiser Sotairos. 8vo. 16 pp. Leipzig.
- Die Depositionsurkunde des Xuthias. 8vo. 11 pp., 1 plate. Leipzig.
- Meyer (C. F. E.) Philologische Miscellen. II. 4to. 20 pp. Herford.
- Minucius Felix. Synnerberg (C.) Randbemerkungen zu Minucius Felix. 8vo. 23 pp. Helsingfors. 1 Mk. (Aus 'Finska's Vetenskabs-Societeten's Förhandlingar.')
- Norden (E.) De Minucii Felicis aetate et genere dicendi. 8vo. 62 pp. Greifswald.
- Nicolai (W.) Beiträge zur Geschichte der Christenverfolgungen. 4to. 18 pp. Eisenach.
- Oehler (Raim.) Der letzte Feldzug des Barkiden Hasdrubal und die Schlacht am Metaurus. Mit Beiträgen von F. Hultsch und V. Pittaluga. 8vo. 82 pp., maps. (Berliner Studien für klassische Philologie, New Series, Vol. II, 1.) Berlin, Calvary. 3 Mk.
- Ovidius. Krassowsky (W.) Ovidius quomodo in isdem fabulis enarrandis a se ipso discrepauerit. 8vo. 38 pp. Königsberg.
- Parmenides' Lehrgedicht, griechisch und deutsch von H. Diels. Mit Anhang über griechische Thüren und Schlösser. 8vo. 164 pp., engravings. Berlin, Reimer. 5 Mk.
- Petersdorff (R.) Uebereinstimmende Nachrichten über die alten Griechen und Germanen aus Homer und Tacitus. I. 4to. 23 pp. Strehlen.
- Pherekydes. Diels (H.) Zur Pentemtychos des Pherekydes. 8vo. 13 pp. Berlin.
- Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt, ediderunt Leop. Cohn et P. Wendland. Voll. II, ed. P. Wendland. 8vo. xxxiv, 315 pp. Berlin, Reimer. 9 Mk.
- Plathner. Die Alleinherrschaft der Peisistratiden. 4to. 19 pp. Dessau.
- Plato. Berdolt (W.) Der Folgesatz bei Plato. Mit historisch-grammatischer Einleitung: Der Konsekutivsatz in der älteren griechischen Litteratur. 8vo. 103 pp. Würzburg.
- Böhme (J.) Zur Protagoras-Frage. 4to. 26 pp. Hamburg.
- Lüddecke (K.) Die Frage der Echtheit und Abfassungszeit des Euthydemus. 8vo. 49 pp. Celle.
- Reiter. De Platonis proprietate quadam dicendi. 4to. 25 pp. Braunsberg.
- Plautus' Rudens übersetzt von Dr. G. Schmillinsky. 4to. 18 pp. Halle. 1 Mk.
- Reich (H.) Die ältesten berufsmässigen Darstellungen des griechisch-italischen Mimus. 8vo. 36 pp. Königsberg.
- Reinach (S.) Répertoire de la statuaire grecque et romaine. Vol. I. 16mo. lxiv, 661 pp. Paris, Leroux. 5 fr.
- Röhl (H.) Zu griechischen und lateinischen Texten (Älian, Anthologia Pal., Athenäus, Cicero, Horaz, Inscriptiones Atticae, Isocrates, Polybius, Thucydides, Xenophon, Xenophon Ephes.) 4to. 18 pp. Halberstadt.
- Sallustius. Kunze (Alfr.) Sallustiana. Pt. 3. Zur Stilistik. I. Beiträge zur Darstellung der genetischen Entwicklung des Sallustianischen Stils. 8vo. xiv, 95 pp. Leipzig, Simmel.
- Schmieding (Prof.) Die neuesten Forschungen über das klassische Altertum, insbesondere das klassische Griechenland. 8vo. 56 pp. Osterwieck. 80 Pf.
- Schöne (A.) Ueber die Ironie in der griechischen Dichtung, insbesondere bei Homer, Aeschylus und Sophocles. 8vo. 23 pp. Kiel.
- Schurz (W.) Die Militärorganisation Hadrians. I. 4to. 26 pp. Gladbach.
- Seeliger (K.) Messenien und der achäische Bund. 4to. 32 pp. Zittau.
- Seneca. Müller (Jo.) Kritische Studien zu den Briefen Seneca's. 8vo. 32 pp. Wien, Gerold. 90 Pf. (Aus 'Sitzungsberichte der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Wien.')
- Siebert. Die ältesten Zeugnisse über das Christentum bei den römischen Schriftstellern. 4to. 32 pp. Charlottenburg.
- Solon. Heinemann (J.) Studia Soloneae. 8vo. 50 pp. Berlin.
- Sophocles. Haberland (O.) De figurae quae vocatur etymologicae usu Sophocleo. 4to. 33 pp. Freienwalde.
- Rademann (A.) Adnotationum ad Sophoclis Oedipi Tyranni vers. 863-910. 4to. 14 pp. Kottbus.
- Tauber (G.) Ueber die grundverschiedene dramatische Verwertung des Iphigenienstoffes durch Euripides und Goethe. 8vo. 26 pp. Prag.
- Tacitus. Liesegang (H.) I. De Taciti vita et scriptis. II. Quo consilio Tacitus Germaniam scripsisse videatur. 4to. 11 pp. Cleve.
- Novak (Rob.) Analecta Tacitea. 8vo. 23 pp. Prag, Storch. 1 Mk. (Aus 'České Museum Filologické.')
- Teichmüller (F.) Grundbegriff und Gebrauch von auctor und auctoritas: I. Auctor. 4to. 23 pp. Wittstock.
- Terentianus. Werth (A.) De Terentiani metris et elocutione. 8vo. 44 pp. Mühlheim.
- Weise (P.) Ueber den Weinbau der Römer. I. 4to. 21 pp. Hamburg.
- Weisweiler (J.) Die consecutio temporum nebst ihren Voraussetzungen aus der Modus- und Tempuslehre. Ein Kapitel der lateinischen Schulgrammatik. 4to. 12 pp. Tremessen.
- Werber (K.) Tertullians Schrift de spectaculis in ihrem Verhältnisse zu Varros rerum divinarum libri. 8vo. 31 pp. Teschen.
- Wissowa (G.) Analecta Romana topographica. 4to. 19 pp. Halle.